Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

JUNE, 1916

"VOX POPULI"

ON THE EVE OF THE NATIONAL CONVENTIONS

BY THE EDITOR

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

We present elsewhere in this Review evidences, drawn from the editorial pages of leading public journals, of the accuracy of our deduction that "never since this Republic demanded that George Washington become its first President has there appeared so striking an instance of the Office seeking the Man"; that "never has been a call so peremptory," never "a constantly swelling force so certain to prove irresistible," and that "rightly or wrongly, wisely or not, the Will of the People will prevail, and Charles Evans Hughes will be the next Republican candidate for President of the United States." There is little to add now to the statement of facts which was then set forth in justification of the opinion thus definitely expressed. The only change that has taken place during the past month, partly in consequence of that publication, is to be found in the growing concretion of a sentiment whose very spontaneity involved a certain vagueness. What was apparent has become real. The hardly perceptible movement has taken form and has acquired strength in such measure that scoffing from whatever source has yielded to irresistible conviction.

Recent political happenings have served only to confirm

Copyright, 1916, by North American Review Corporation. All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the judgment adventured somewhat in advance of common recognition. Massachusetts led the way with an emphatic repudiation of the bogeyman, in the face of a vigorous and expensive canvass; the hard-thinking, native-born farmers to the north promptly followed with a vote of two to one for the man who was not a candidate; within a week Oregon, in the felicitous words of our discerning neighbor the *Sun*, "signalled back to Vermont" from across the continent with an overwhelming majority for Hughes over the two leading Western candidates who had made active personal campaigns; Kansas swung into line "to a man"; twelve members of the Wisconsin delegation followed suit; Michigan, whose primaries had been carried for Ford, with but one dissenting vote out of 1,400 in State convention, pronounced Hughes her second and real choice; Nebraska put aside both her own favorite son and her neighbor's; Minnesota responded no less readily,—and so on.

Simultaneously a poll of Republican members of the House of Representatives showed 62 for Hughes to 11 each for Burton and Cummins, and 10 for Roosevelt, and a remarkable test by the *Literary Digest* of Republican members of State legislatures produced 894 for Hughes, 352 for Roosevelt, and 181 for Root.

"But," remarked the Boston *Transcript* quite truly from its own standpoint as an earnest advocate of the nomination of Mr. Hughes, "the best omen in the political development of the day is the announcement from New York that the Progressive Executive Committee report the Progressive party as ready to support Justice Hughes on two conditions: (1) That the Republicans refuse to nominate Colonel Roosevelt. (2) That the declaration of principles which Mr. Hughes will make immediately after his acceptance of the Republican nomination and his resignation from the bench, proves him to be in sympathy with the principles of Americanism for which the Progressives under Mr. Roosevelt's leadership are fighting. No reasonable Republican having the welfare of the nation at heart could ask for more at this time from the Progressive organization. No reasonable Progressive can find fault with the Americanism which Mr. Hughes would champion, were he free to declare himself."

And the distinguished editor of the Hartford *Courant*, himself a delegate-at-large to the convention, added pointedly respecting the Progressive announcement:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That may be taken as a purely formal condition. The Progressives would not have made such a statement, even with the condition attached, if they had not believed that it could be easily complied with. They know pretty well in advance what Justice Hughes stands for in public life. The tentative promise to support him is, in fact, an expression of confidence, and this confidence in him will be his strength in the convention and before the people. Whether or not he is to be the choice of the convention no man can now say, but there are few, if any, who doubt that, if he should be nominated, his election would be practically a foregone conclusion.

But as a seeker of truth and light we would not attach undue importance to the views of those whose predilections may impair their vision. While cheerfully recognizing the political sagacity of both the *Courant* and the *Transcript,* which was the first to herald the inevitableness of Mr. Hughes, we have long suspected Dr. Charles Hopkins Clark of Republican leanings and of late we have found Mr. James T. Williams, Jr.'s criticism of our present Administration so very strongly helpful as to be most disquieting. We turn instinctively for guidance, therefore, to members of the family whose fidelity to forward-looking ideals is hardly less questionable than that of Colonel Mouse himself. Of these the first and foremost, of course, is Dean Henry Watterson, who is firmly convinced that Mr. Roosevelt will be nominated but not elected, only to be removed from the White House at some distant day "feet first."

Then comes the *World,* the didactic leader of the Administration press, whose president, Mr. Ralph Pulitzer, is to attend the St. Louis convention as a delegate and be voted as a segment of Mr. Charles F. Murphy's "unit." That, however, like the Charleston judge's wife, is "a circumstance over whom one has no control." The point is that Mr. Cobb agrees with Mr. Watterson that probably the Republicans will surrender to Our Colonel and declares further with marked positiveness that in no conceivable instance can the nomination go to Mr. Hughes. There are "four obstacles" in the way. The first is "the undisguised opposition of the Old Guard, which knows that if elected he will smash the machine." The second is Theodore Roosevelt "who knows that the nomination of Mr. Hughes would end his own political career." These are obstacles no doubt; also to many minds they are most excellent reasons. Then there are the "misgivings about the propriety of nominating a Justice

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Supreme Court" and the lack of information respecting Mr. Hughes's opinions, etc., etc.

So the situation appeared to the *World* on May 12th. A week later, although the intervening Vermont primaries signified "nothing so far as the Hughes candidacy is concerned," and "all reports of a drift toward Hughes or toward anybody, except as the Republican leaders start it or stop it are nonsense," oddly enough the Roosevelt movement had actually "petered out." Finally, on May 23rd, we learned that "Roosevelt's Boy Scouts are now making their last drive against the Hughes candidacy," but that "where the rank and file has had a chance to express itself it has shown a decided preference for mind over noise." In other words, not unfamiliar to our readers, "nobody wants Hughes—but the people," and the *World,* to its credit be it said, believing that "what the United States requires most of all is not less brains but more brains in its political leadership," would now "welcome the nomination of Justice Hughes by the Republican convention."

Frankly, the *World* could hardly do less without discredit to its creator. Joseph Pulitzer evinced his opinion of Mr. Hughes when in his will he designated him as a trustee of his estate. The duties were nominal. The fee was $100,000. Mr. Hughes is a poor man. Nobody would have dreamed of criticizing him for accepting the appointment. He declined it without hesitation upon the ground that a public official has no right to accept remuneration from private sources,—not even a Carnegie pension, for which, as a former Professor in Cornell University, he might, of course, have applied.

From the converted *World* we turn to the unregenerate *Times,* only to be lost in a fog of bewilderment. "A Strange Boom," it calls the general uprising for Hughes, and proceeds impatiently:

> There is a great clatter, a sort of accelerated and pumped-up enthusiasm about the so-called Hughes boom. Colonel George Harvey hears it in every breeze, demands it himself, and forthwith translates himself into "the people," "the man in the street," and so on. How are you going to find out the opinion of 8,000,000 Republican voters? A "straw vote," the writing in of Mr. Hughes's name on certain primary tickets, always at the suggestion of some Republican editor or politician, a newspaper vote: such is the gauge of the voice of the people.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This was on May 17th. Four days later, however, we read:

The *Times* was wrong about Hughes. The people are calling him. The German people.

"The German people"—of Vermont and Oregon, which have a larger percentage of native-born citizens than any other two States in the Union. But let the *Times* continue:

The continuing use of the name of an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court as a pawn of politicians is coming to be, is become, offensive and painful to those Americans who believe that a Justice of that tribunal should have no part or lot in politics. What public confidence can it keep if the path from it to the White House is not barred as it always has been barred? Decisions for political motives—that is what will be the fact or the belief if the Supreme Court is a training ground of Presidents. Never has a President been taken thence. Never will one be taken thence unless a great tradition, which stands on the impregnable necessity of keeping the Supreme Court out of politics, is violated.

Mr. Justice Hughes must see that the spectacle of his robes fluttering in the winds of rumor or rustling up the back stairs of deal and combination is unseemly. If he takes his boom seriously, he should get off the bench.

Can it be that the *Times* forgot that on April 28th it had said no less caustically:

Isn't *The Manchester Union* a little officious in declaring that "there are but two courses open to Mr. Hughes, with an immediate decision imperative in order to safeguard the Supreme Court against the imputation that a member of that austere body may remain in his place on the highest bench in the land and continue to be a receptive candidate for the Presidency"? In short, Mr. Justice Hughes must resign and say yes or say no for good, after the manner of General Sherman. Mr. Justice Hughes is believed to be fully capable of attending to his own business, and probably he knows a little more about "that austere body" than some of the purists who are bent on "smoking him out."

The task of reconciling these sharp declarations we leave most humbly to our determined neighbor, merely suggesting that on the very day—May 21st—when it was sneering at the most notable popular demand of recent years, it might have derived some enlightenment from its own headlines on Page 3, to wit:

See Hughes Boom Making Great Gains—Reported that One Favorite Son Will Withdraw and Another Support the Justice

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—Oregon Vote Impressive—Borah Says Hughes Would Have Carried Every State Primary Had His Name Been On the Ballot.

We shall be surprised if Dr. Charles R. Miller does not view the inevitable outcome in Chicago "with grave concern." Meanwhile we commend to his earnest consideration the prophecy, printed elsewhere, of the New York *Herald*, not only the shrewdest political forecaster in the country but nearly if not quite as "disinterested" as President Wilson's morganatic ambassador, and to the following from his wise alma mater of Springfield, Massachusetts:

It no longer avails to account for the growing Hughes strength as "the artificial creation of masters of manipulation who are using the Justice's name as a blind," to quote the New York *Times*. The strength of an unsought candidacy lies first in the understanding of this man's character as shown in his work as Governor of New York, and second in the search for a harmony candidate who would heal the breach of 1912. Republicans of the rank and file possess more keenness of judgment than exploiting politicians are ready to credit them with. The average man remembers that the series of speeches which Mr. Hughes made in 1908 on behalf of Mr. Taft as a Presidential candidate furnished ample proof of the manner of man he is. He exhibited such moral and intellectual force in the presentation of policies and issues as gave to the country the only advocacy on the Republican side that is remembered.

And if there lurks in our neighbor's mind a doubt respecting acceptance, we would direct his attention to the following explicit utterance made with undoubted authority over his own signature by Mr. James T. Williams, Jr., Editor of the Boston *Transcript*, in a dispatch from Washington:

If the Chicago convention nominates Charles Evans Hughes for the Presidency he will accept the nomination and simultaneously send his resignation from the Supreme Court to the President. No authorized announcement of this fact will be made by Mr. Hughes in advance of his nomination, and he will not consent to involve the great court in politics by making any statement of his political views in advance of the convention. If nominated he will stand upon the platform of the convention that nominates him, and if he cannot accept its platform he will not accept its nomination. There have been efforts within the last few weeks to induce Mr. Hughes to resign from the bench and announce his candidacy for the Presidency. These efforts have failed and they will probably fail if renewed. Mr. Hughes has too much respect for the Supreme Court to become a candidate for the Presidency while he is a member of that tribunal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and he has too much respect for the Presidency to decline a nomination to that office if it is offered to him.

He is attending to his work as a member of the Supreme Court, and that he will continue to do unless and until he is nominated for the Presidency. Then he will resign, and devote every day until the election to his campaign.

The Second Ballot is our guess.

ROOSEVELT AND THE PROGRESSIVES

We have expressed the opinion that Hughes would not be nominated and that Roosevelt would cut his throat if he were. We still hold to that belief.—*New York World.*

"Reserving the right to object,"—as the Honorable James R. Mann would remark—or at least to question the accuracy of its prognostication, upon what ground does the *World* base its judgment that Mr. Roosevelt would, *if he could,* "cut the throat" of Mr. Hughes? Surely not upon anything that he has said nor upon anything that can be justly inferred from what he has said.

"I have not expressed and do not intend to express myself as being for or against any man," he declared as late as May 1st. And three days later, alluding to the *World's* assertion that in private conversation he had referred to Mr. Hughes as "that Baptist hypocrite," he said flatly, "This is just as preposterous as if it had been said that Mr. Hughes had called me a Dutch Reformed dinosaur. One statement would be just as true as the other and just as ridiculous." Granting that this denial would lack conclusiveness if it could be shown that the learned and discriminating Justice has in fact instanced Our Colonel as a rare specimen of archisaurian reptiles with ambulatory feet, two-headed ribs, perforate acetabula and no interclavicle, of the Dutch Reformed persuasion, the point must be heeded that no evidence to that effect has been adduced. What we do know Mr. Hughes said of Mr. Roosevelt, not in private conversation to be sure, but in a public speech in 1908, is this:

President McKinley, a victim of insensate passion, laid down his life, trusted and beloved by all the people. To the difficult task then devolved upon him, with the problems created by an unparalleled prosperity came a new leader, dear to the people's heart. He entered upon his work with courage and determination, and four years ago

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he received an overwhelming vote of popular confidence. For seven years, with lofty aim and unconquerable spirit, he has labored for the people, and to-day, by virtue of his sincere devotion to their welfare, his valiant attack upon evil in high places, his zeal for the common interest, whether in the protection of the public domain or in insistence upon the freedom of interstate trade, or in the maintenance of high standards of administration, or in the recognition of the rights of labor, or in the care of our natural resources, the forceful and representative leader is typified to the popular imagination in the person of Theodore Roosevelt.

And he added, as if having in mind the very situation existing to-day, these significant words:

The business of the great national departments has been in worthy and competent hands. The mention alone of Hay, Root and Taft suffices to call attention to the honorable conduct of affairs in which all our citizens take just pride. The dignity and honor of the nation have been maintained and troublesome difficulties have been adjusted with an access of prestige. And every American has been gratified by the possession of world-wide influence attained by the President both by reason of his personal qualities and because of the distinction in our international relations of which he has been the head.

While admitting that the immediate question is not what Mr. Hughes thinks of Mr. Roosevelt but what Mr. Roosevelt thinks of Mr. Hughes, the fact nevertheless is patent that Our Colonel could not easily put himself at loggerheads on matters of principle with one who held his own administration in so high esteem. But this consideration bears no weight in the view of the *World* and Mr. Watterson, both of whom are convinced that Mr. Roosevelt is consumed by a devouring passion to re-occupy the White House at whatever cost to his own reputation or his honor. We prefer to believe and do believe the contrary. While not questioning for a moment that Our Colonel frankly shares with many others the opinion that he is better equipped than any other by both temperament and experience to take the helm at this or perhaps any juncture, we can detect no sign whatever of insincerity in his recent utterances. It is easy, even natural, to scoff at his declaration that he does "not wish the nomination," but there is every reason on both public and personal grounds why he should not care to be nominated unless satisfied that he would be elected,—and it would be surprising indeed if his doubts upon that score did not resolve into virtual certainty. To our mind the mere fact that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so astute a politician pronounces unequivocally for compulsory universal military training,—which surely none better than himself must realize the country would reject overwhelmingly,— is conclusive that he has no expectation of becoming the candidate. When further he expressed the "earnest hope that the delegates will nominate some man on whom all Republicans and all Progressives can unite," he not only placed an impassable barrier before both himself and Mr. Root, but he practically left a clear path for only one man—Charles Evans Hughes.

Theodore Roosevelt as President never did and never could render so great a service to his country as he is now rendering as a patriot. The evangels of which he has become the foremost herald are neither fantastic nor dubious; they are true and splendid and are recognized as such gladly and gratefully by millions whose regard is priceless. That he would or will permit impairment of this unique and inestimable possession through common self-seeking is simply inconceivable. That he would or will strive for the perpetuation of a Government which he considers ignoble by conniving at the defeat of Charles Evans Hughes as a candidate for President on a platform embodying the very "great and vital principles" which he himself is upholding so admirably is the acme of absurdity. The *World* must make another guess to fit its wish.

THE UNITED DEMOCRACY

After backward-gazing Chicago, forward-looking St. Louis should be restful. Not since Andrew Jackson took counsel by proxy at Baltimore in 1835 has the Democratic party been as harmonious in National convention assembled as it promises faithfully to be this year. An extraordinary, an amazing spectacle it is bound to be. We doubt if a harsh word will be spoken. In any case, if by inadvertence there should be, the speaker will be knocked down and reasoned with. Glory be, at last we have a United Democracy—united in purpose, in thought, in everything that appertains to peace and prosperity. Chairman William F. McCombs, who will salute his fellow workers after the manner indicated by the classical phrase, is united. Speaker Champ Clark, who may unhappily be prevented by official duties from accepting the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

distinguished honor of presiding for a while, is nevertheless united. Senator James A. O'Gorman, who unselfishly declines what some regard as a virtually certain re-election, is united. Senator James Edgar Martine, the first product of personal selection, will continue to be united unless or until separated at the primaries. Senator Underwood is united. Colonel Henry Watterson, although less active than in the days of Tilden, is united. Mr. Henry Morgenthau is united. Messrs. Untermyer and Brandeis are united. Messrs. Charles R. Crane and Norman Hapgood are, or at least were until recently, united. And so we might continue indefinitely. We have never seen anything like it.

The programme of the great convention, although only tentative at this writing, is encouraging. Mr. Martin H. Glynn, who spoke up bravely in reply to Mr. Root, will probably strike the preliminary top-note; the platform, formulated in cloistered aloofness, will, it is understood, be firm in approval of certain policies; the two militant Secretaries, Messrs. Josephus Daniels and Newton D. Baker, will have general charge of affairs; Judge Woodchuck will emerge in the nick of time to remake the nominating speech; and Brother William Jennings Bryan, by order of Nebraska, will sit with the pressmen instead of on the floor and report the proceedings for the *World* for $1,000 per eight-hour day.

Blissfully, though somewhat listlessly, we contemplate the prospect at St. Louis. The cynicism of Judge E. Rockwood Hoar, who, when asked if he was going to attend the funeral of Wendell Phillips, replied that he was not but that he approved of it, makes no appeal to us.

We refuse to stay away from St. Louis.

AMERICA IS THE ISSUE

America is the issue. There is nothing else of consequence in this year's campaign. It may be strange, and it is discreditable, that such should be the case; but so it is. We had thought that after all these years, and after the great events with which they have been marked, there would be no need again of raising such an issue. It has been forced upon us, however; partly by insolent alien aggression, and partly—from one point of view the more culpably—by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

domestic pusillanimity and potential treason. The issue is not to be dreaded, for there can be no doubt of the ability or of the will of the American people to meet it and to dispose of it. The hope is that they will dispose of it so radically, and indeed so remorselessly, that it will not be raised nor so much as heard of again within the lifetime of the youngest and most longeval person now living between Eastport and San Diego.

For it has already been raised too often. Our history began with it, and has been marked again and again with its repetition in protean phases. The original colonists came hither, to Jamestown and to Plymouth, for the sake of an America which should free them from the evils of the European system. They found themselves still subject to those evils, however, because of the division of the continent between two rival Powers, in whose frequent wars they could not avoid being involved. Consequently, they did the major part of the work in expelling one of those Powers, and leaving the other supreme over all between the Mississippi and the Atlantic. But in that very achievement the same issue in another form was raised again, and the work which had been begun in colonization and advanced in the conquests of the French and Indian war, had to be carried further in Revolution and Independence.

The issue was raised again in the first Presidential Administration, when it had to be decided whether this nation should maintain neutrality, or be dragged as a catspaw into European broils. A little later it arose again, over our right to navigate the Mississippi and the menace of having a great and potentially hostile Power planted between that river and the Rocky Mountains; and it was settled, apparently, by our acquisition of the great territory in question. Ten years later saw us involved in another foreign war to establish American rights at sea; and that had passed by only a few years when the Holy Alliance forced it upon us once more.

We have not yet celebrated the centenary of the Doctrine which was supposed to establish the principle of America First, forever; yet in the less than a hundred years we have again and again been compelled to reassert that principle against some more or less open challenge. Of all such occasions, the latest, the present, is the most flagrant of all. Never, in the times of the Orders in Council and the Ber-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lin and Milan Decrees, were American rights at sea more cynically iguored, more ruthlessly or more savagely violated. Never, in the days of Gallican and Anti-Gallican, was the pernicious spirit of alien-inspired faction more rampant than it is to-day. We are called upon to inquire of the world whether America has any rights which other nations are bound to respect; and to demand of ourselves whether our political courses are to be determined by our own interests or by those of alien lands.

The issue transcends immeasurably all personal or partisan considerations. It is not factional; it is national. It embraces within itself all other questions of policy which may be raised. Questions of tariff and revenue, questions of immigration and naturalization, questions of army and navy, questions of anything that can be conceived, all hinge and hang upon the one supreme question, Shall this Republic be sufficient unto itself to fulfill its self-proclaimed mission, of being a free and independent nation, having "full power to do all acts and things which independent States may of right do"? Are American citizens to be free to traverse the high seas in safety? Are American industries to be protected against the torch and the bomb of agents of alien Powers? Are American laws to be made and enforced, and American principles to be maintained, without being warped or twisted to suit the sinister designs of alien Powers? In brief, is America to be able to live her own life, unimperilled by the wars of other continents; or is she to be dragged, as in colonial days, into alien quarrels in which she has no proper lot nor part? Are we Americans and is this America? Or are we subjects of some European prince and is this the fighting ground of European Powers?

There is no exaggeration in saying that this is the one supreme issue, the only one worth thinking or caring about in this year's campaign. It is no question of this party or of that party; but of America. It is no question whether this candidate or that candidate is the most available; but of America. It is no question of this petty principle or of that picayune policy; but of America. The question of robust, unwavering, unhyphenated and fully prepared Americanism is the one by which every candidate is to be tested in an acid test. It is the one upon which every party convention will be expected unequivocally to declare itself.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GERMANIA PACIFICA

"Timeo Teutones et dona ferentes."

One of the most interesting and perhaps the most significant of all the features of the present preparedness-pacifist controversy is the zeal of Germany and Germans for the latter side. The German Government, through its Chancellor and other Ministers at home and its Ambassadors abroad, as well as through its press, has become the very apostle and protagonist of peace and disarmament—for the United States. Alone of all the Governments of Europe it takes that stand. In season and out of season, it never wearies of assuring us that the United States has nothing to fear from it. We might disband our army and scuttle our navy, and we would be just as safe as we are now. Germany has no designs against us or against anybody in the western hemisphere. Much as she desires a "place in the sun," she covets no foothold in America. And it grieves that irenic empire to the heart to see us wasting our substance upon military preparations.

The same, even more earnestly and vehemently, is the tone of Germans in America. If we cannot say, to paraphrase a famous remark of Horace Greeley's, that every pacifist is a German, at least we can say that every German is—professedly—a pacifist. Is there an organization opposed to preparedness? You will find Germans among its founders and promoters. Is there a society for peace at any price? Its roll of members is rich in German names. Is there a petition against army and navy increase? Its signatures have a distinctly Teutonic cast.

To the most detached and disinterested observer this must be a strange phenomenon. For Germany vaunts herself upon being the most militant—or militaristic, in pacifist patter—of nations. Here, conspicuously above all other imported elements, they cherish a warlike disposition, and are leagued in warlike organizations. No others have their "*Scheutzen Corps.*" No others have in this country a national league of semi-military organization, such as that which Prince Henry of Prussia came hither to promote. Above all other naturalized citizens, the German is in fact a militarist. Is it not a singularly suggestive circumstance that in profession he is above all others a pacifist?

"Timeo Teutones et dona ferentes."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"LUSITANIA" DAY: MAY 7, 1916

BY "HISTORICUS"

THIS is the first anniversary of the sinking of the *Lusitania,* a day whose recurrence will always bring with it very painful memories for all loyal Americans until a German Republic or a Constitutional Monarchy arises on the ruins of German Militarism.

The writer hoped to be able to write an article in praise of President Wilson's attitude, alike in his recent address to Congress and in his spirited dispatch to the German Government on the savagery of her submarine warfare, followed, it was hoped, with an absolute demand upon her that she should abandon "frightfulness" and cease her constant violations of all the laws alike of God and man in her frantic and foolish efforts to make herself not only the lord of all lands but also the mistress of all seas. Happily, many other Americans loyal to the bravest and best traditions of their fathers have expressed in substance the same views, giving credit to the President for his belated but very welcome stand in favor of the honor and dignity of the greatest Republic in history. Unfortunately, he did not draw the sharp distinction between the interference by Great Britain with our making more money and the killing by Germany of our innocent people, and perhaps in consequence of his failure at any time to have drawn sharply and distinctly that awful distinction, we are now sunk into a greater depth of humiliation and degradation than ever; for to his manly, moderate and clear demand that the rights of humanity should be recognized in this dreadful war, there comes back the same familiar, outworn reply, evasive when it is not false, and always insolent, yielding in very truth hardly anything except in words, and making even such light concessions dependent upon our granting the impudent demand that we should require other nations to observe what Germany

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pleases to call international law,—violations of which she says interfere with the movement of commerce,—as a condition precedent to her respecting those laws when they involve the loss of the lives of thousands of innocent men, women and children who have done nothing whatever to deserve the terrible fate Germany has inflicted upon them, and continues to inflict upon them.

This reply of Germany's recalls inevitably the murder of the little school-children on the peaceful streets of Scarborough on their way to school by bombs dropped upon them by Germany in willful murder. So many like atrocities have been committed by Germany since the war began that it is not wonderful that her military and naval leaders, who are now the only authorized spokesmen of her sixty-five millions of people, should have come to regard it as their right to kill whom they choose, when they choose, and where they choose, and of whatever nationality.

It is of course very late to speak the truth, but it is never too late to do so. For over sixty years the spirit of pan-Germanism has dominated the governing classes first of Prussia and then of Germany, conferring on those classes and the navies and armies they controlled the absolute right to murder, ravish and drown all men, women and children of whatever nation and under whatever protection, if such treatment by them would by its "frightfulness" aid Germany in her mad scheme of world conquest. If the most sacred treaties stood in the way of such infernal deeds they were but "scraps of paper." If a peaceful and happy nation stood in their path, they had the right "to hack their way through it." From such views—and these are their words, not ours—the dullest mind could foresee that they must wage war with the help of liars, spies and criminals; and so they have done, infesting our neutral and peaceful country with many thousands of such scoundrels, engaging in all kinds of atrocities from day to day. It follows as the day the night that no nation, hoping to preserve its own respect or the respect of its loyal citizens, can hope to maintain diplomatic relations with Germany—unless she mends her ways.

While all the rest of the world has been progressing towards a larger measure of liberty and humanity, pan-Germanism has separated itself from all forward-looking nations, and, turning its back upon democracy with contempt,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has marched steadily backwards toward the dark ages of "government by the divine right of kings" and an absolute naval and military autocracy—a movement whose steps in this twentieth century after Christ can only lead Germany sooner or later to the abyss of Hell. It may take more time than was hoped; more peaceful women, more children, may be assassinated; more nuns in their holy works of love and charity may be submitted to unnamable outrages; more shrines of religion, more homes of art dedicated to the uplifting of the human spirit may be destroyed by Krupp's monster cannon: but let us never forget that

Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small;
Though with patience He stands waiting, with exactness grinds He all,

and that out of this mad welter of barbarous murder, which the governing class in Germany persists in miscalling warfare, may emerge for Germany also the great happiness of "government of the people, by the people and for the people," and sweep away the horror now making them a demented nation, vainly trying to force upon mankind "government of a military caste, by a military caste, and for a military caste," who have only one motto—"whatever helps our swords and guns to hack our way through is right, no matter how foul or brutal it may be; for our only motto is '*Deutschland über alles.*'"

Whoever wishes to know the truth as to the extent to which German barbarity has gone need only read a very temperate and moderate article by Paul van Dyke, Professor of Modern European History in Princeton University since 1908, printed in the *New York Times' Current History of the War* for the month of May. One may become impatient at his moderation, but among other truthful statements he makes, he quotes the official doctrine of the United States and the practice of its officers with regard to hostages and retaliations fifty years ago, contrasting it with the doctrine and practice of the German Government, and of its army and navy, on the same subject today. The German practice in these matters, so opposite to our own, was actually flung into our teeth by the deliberate application of it to our own citizens after the most solemn warning to Germany that it should not apply it to them—a warning to her in the most ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plicit terms not to destroy any merchant vessel of the United States and not to cause the death of any American citizen.

On the 7th of May, 1915, under direct orders given by the naval and military authorities of Germany, one of her submarines sank the *Lusitania* with over a thousand passengers on board, drowning a large number of innocent men, women and children, among them more than a hundred Americans. We immediately contended *in words* that this act was unlawful and in violation of many sacred principles of justice and humanity. We refused to accept the miserable palliations offered by Germany for the deed, and we based our protest against it on very distinct grounds. We said we were contending for something much greater than any rights of property or privileges of commerce. The Government of the United States was contending for nothing less high and sacred than *the rights of humanity,* and it is upon this principle of humanity as well as upon the law of nations founded upon it that the United States took her stand, a stand to which Germany also had assented by her signature to the Hague Convention of 1907.

"In doing his duty as a citizen by forming his own opinion as to whether the stand taken by the Government of the Republic on the high and sacred rights of humanity was right or wrong, it is proper for every loyal American to take into account what lies behind the *Lusitania,* for this nation was confronted with a theory of the German military authorities," which the writer has placed plainly before us all in their own words and their own practices described by themselves. Precisely the same attitude which underlies the utterances and acts in time of war on the part of the German naval and military authorities, which Professor van Dyke described in German words, underlies, as he truthfully says, the famous Zabern incident which occurred shortly before the outbreak of the war. Both, he said, proceed "from *a certain abnormal caste consciousness, a certain exaltation of all military and naval persons above all civil persons, a certain deification of armed forces as the incarnation of the greatest human qualities and the highest potential of patriotism, which makes the gains of war seem like the smile of God.*"

In December, 1913, there was a serious difficulty between the garrison of the Alsatian town of Zabern and its inhabitants. In the course of this difficulty a lieutenant of the regiment in garrison wounded severely with his saber a lame

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

schoolmaster who had made to him what he considered an insulting remark. The lieutenant and his superior officers—for he claimed to have acted in the spirit of orders given to them in regard to their attitude toward the civil population—were court-martialed, but were acquitted by the military authorities.

The affair created an extraordinary excitement in Germany. The leading papers, with few exceptions, condemned the action of the Government which supported the military authority, but the action of the pretended representative assembly of Germany was even more significant. After speeches by General von Falkenhayn and von Bethmann-Hollweg, the Reichstag passed (293 to 54) a vote of lack of confidence, which would have brought about the fall of any responsible ministry in any constitutional Government, but of course such vote had no influence in a despotic naval and military Government such as that of Germany.

The American Republic owes it to herself, to the world, and to the German people to stand by her own principles and the principles of humanity, and to assert them without compromise against any attempt in the past or in the future on the part of the German naval and military authorities to apply to American citizens their principle of government: "That excessive humanitarian notions should not limit the only true humanity, which very often lies in a ruthless application of certain severities indispensable to war."

President Wilson himself wrote lately to Senator Stone (who impudently insisted on designating the ships on which free American citizens might sail) "that to forbid our people to exercise their rights for fear we might be called upon to vindicate them would be a deep humiliation indeed. It would be an implicit, all but explicit, acquiescence in the violation of the rights of man everywhere. It would be a deliberate abdication of our hitherto proud position as spokesman even among the turmoils of war for the law and the right."

These be brave words indeed, and they make every loyal American feel more proud of his country and its President than he had been at liberty to feel since the declaration of neutrality at the outbreak of the war and the many humiliations we have accepted at the hands of Germany in that long interval; but where do we stand today? It is fitting that Mr. Bryan should sound, as he has sounded, a loud note of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

triumph over the surrender by President Wilson of these brave words, and their inevitable implications, for here we stand on the anniversary of the bloody massacre by Germany of one hundred and fifteen of our innocent men, women and children on a peaceful errand, on a peaceful ship sailing the high seas under the protection of the law of nations and of their American citizenship, and nothing really done.

It is hateful for any American to express the opinion that this acquiescence on the part of President Wilson is due to the advice, said to have been given to him by Mr. Bryan at the outbreak of the war, that he must never lose sight of the German vote, but now that the election is so near at hand that thought necessarily appears to have far greater importance than it really possesses.

It is true that there is a small body of bribed or demented Germans scattered all over our country organized into alliances and other associations, who, long before the war broke out, were engaged in converting such few Germans as were amenable to their solicitations into treason to the fundamental principles of the American Government. Those principles are contained in the Declaration of Independence, in our Constitution, and in the undying aspiration of Mr. Lincoln for government by the people. In addition to the few German traitors among us hating this doctrine and striving to destroy it, must be added a much smaller number of demented Irishmen who cherish the same traitorous hopes and who are now shown to have been in actual league with the German traitors. But outside of these two small bodies, there are the great overwhelming masses of American citizens of Irish birth or descent, or of German birth or descent, who are as loyal to American democracy as any man born and reared under our flag. They are, in this generation, the representatives of the spirit of that brave Irish brigade led by General Meagher into the heart of many battles and of those devoted German brigades who equalled the highest measure of heroism attained by any of the soldiers on either side of our Civil War. If General Meagher may be cited as an example of the loyalty and bravery of the Irish soldiers of the Republic, General Schurz may be as fitly cited as an example of the loyalty and bravery of the German troops who fought as gallantly in the same historic struggle.

Unhappily, however, politicians feel the importance only of the men nearest to them and think nothing of the great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

masses of " the plain people " who stood by Mr. Lincoln all through the Civil War, and will today stand by any public man who represents to them in very truth a loyal American, no matter what may be his party name or affiliations. Unhappily, too, for the Democratic Party, it seems definitely committed to the support of a candidate who, although he has moments when he sees the clear vision of American courage and fidelity to liberty, soon sinks back into what appears to be a childish apprehension of the Irish hyphens and the German hyphens, and betrays alike the dignity and honor of a trusting people committted to his hands.

No matter from what land or from what blood a citizen comes, so that he be, from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet, a loyal American in the sense in which so many of our great ancestors proved themselves to be, he is welcome to our fellowship and friendship as if he or his ancestors had never lived a day beyond the protection of the Stars and Stripes. So long, however, as German militarism, with all its hateful implications, is allowed to dominate the German people, we must observe with reverence and with sorrow each recurring anniversary of the sinking of the *Lusitania,* as we do our anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, dropping this observance as soon as the German people resume their rights of self-government and again take their place in the family of civilized nations.

Meanwhile, we shall continue to hope, even against hope, that the war which German militarism is still waging with such unexampled savagery against Christian civilization and democracy will be defeated, and that liberty will again emerge victorious, with blessings for all the children of men.

Let us take to heart the prophecy of Carlyle:

> Man has walked by the light of conflagrations and amidst the sound of falling cities, and now there is darkness and long watching until it be morning. The voice of the faithful can but exclaim: As yet strikes the twelfth hour of the night. Birds of darkness are on the wing, specters arise, the dead walk, the living dream. *Thou eternal Providence will cause the day to dawn.*

"HISTORICUS."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ENGLISH DEMOCRACY IN WAR TIME

BY SIDNEY LOW

SCENE: The British House of Commons at Westminster. An exciting debate is in progress on the conduct of the war in the East. An honorable member in khaki, with one arm in a sling, rises to address the assembly. He is a distinguished officer lately returned from the Dardanelles. The House is crowded in every part—with one exception. The front bench on the right hand of the Speaker's chair, which is allotted by custom to the members of His Majesty's Government, is almost empty. Not a single Cabinet Minister—and there are twenty-two of them—is in his place. The sole occupants of the Ministerial Bench are two or three under-secretaries. The gallant officer is dilating at some length, and with much frankness, on the mistakes which have occurred in the management of the Gallipoli expedition; and he comments with especial severity on the conduct, or as he plainly regards it the misconduct, of certain generals in high command. The House follows him with close attention, and his discourse is punctuated with frequent cheers. Suddenly he pauses in order to make a dramatic appeal to the ministers, and discovers that there are no ministers to answer his question. The responsibile executive of Great Britain has not thought fit to listen to this pointed indictment.

The colonel comments on their absence in tones of resentment which find an echo throughout the Chamber. It is an insult to the House, he exclaims, and the remark is received with applause. The under-secretaries huddle together and whisper; but they have no explanation to give of the absence of their chiefs, who, in fact, after listening to a statement from Mr. Asquith, have gone off to their dinner in a body, not apparently thinking it worth while to waste time over the proceedings of that High Court of Parliament which is theoretically the supreme governing organ of the British

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Empire. The indignation of the House at this open testimony to its insignificance waxes furious; and when a member moves that the sitting be suspended to mark its sense of the ministerial conduct, the motion is carried without dissent.

The incident is a characteristic illustration of the relations which prevail between the executive and the legislature in Great Britain at the present moment. Nothing has been more remarkable than the rapid growth during the war of the Cabinet autocracy and the shrinkage of the influence and authority of Parliament. According to the theory of the British Constitution the Cabinet is simply a committee of high officials, appointed by the King to administer the national business under the strict supervision of Parliament. The members of this committee are supposed to be accountable to the representatives of the people at every stage. It is within the rights of every member of Parliament to address questions to them on any matter of public policy; and it is assumed that they must be at all times prepared to defend and vindicate their conduct of affairs in the House, which can cause them to modify their plans, or deprive them of their offices if it is not satisfied with their explanations. No new law can be passed unless it is approved by the majority of the House of Commons on the second and third readings of the bill and in committee; and no expenditure can be incurred without the sanction of a vote. Theoretically, these safeguards should make the Government the obedient and disciplined servants of the representative assembly. American, as well as English, constitutionalists have frequently insisted on the intimate association between the administration and the legislature under the Parliamentary, as contrasted with the Congressional, system. In the United States, it is said, that there is no such constant and direct control of the Chief Executive as in Great Britain, where the Cabinet officers are also the leaders of the dominant party in Parliament. But no American President, not even Lincoln, during the crisis of the Civil War, could have acted with more independence than the Cabinet of Mr. Asquith. We have seen again and again that the control of the House is almost nominal, and that the Ministry does practically what it pleases with the smallest possible regard to the wishes or the susceptibilities of the elected legislature.

This is not solely a consequence of the war. It is true that in every country, and under every constitution, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Executive must be clothed with extraordinary powers when it is carrying on hostilities against the national enemy. In war time it is impossible to allow full scope for the discussion and deliberation which democratic government prescribes at other periods. Sometimes the emergency is met by abolishing the ordinary forms of constitutional procedure altogether and placing the administration in the hands of a virtual dictator acting under the authority of martial law,—which, as a great English jurist has said, is not law at all. At the opening of the European War in August, 1914, it was not deemed necessary in Great Britain to adopt this extreme course. The Government was, however, invested with all sorts of exceptional powers under a statute, hastily passed, called the Defence of the Realm Act, which dispenses with many of the restraints placed by the law and by the legal tribunals upon executive action. While this act was generally approved, it was not regarded as relieving the Cabinet from the necessity of submitting its actions to Parliamentary approval, or of freeing it from legislative criticism. It was still assumed that the Cabinet would continue to exercise its functions subject to the direct control of the popular representatives, and therefore indirectly of the electorate as a whole. But no committee of public safety, no dictator invested with plenary power, no autocratic sovereign in a continental monarchy, could have been less trammelled by discussion or criticism than the Cabinet of King George V.

The functions of the House of Commons have been virtually in abeyance since the autumn of last year. It would be idle to say that the members as a whole, any more than their fellow-citizens outside the walls of Westminster, are completely satisfied with everything that has been done, or that they are not at times extremely anxious for fuller explanations. Their anxiety and their dissatisfaction are mostly ignored by ministers. Occasionally Mr. Asquith or Sir Edward Grey will come down to the House to deliver an exposition on military, diplomatic, or financial policy. Then there may be a debate, and one or two independent legislators may assail the ministerial pronouncement with searching questions or pungent criticism. Criticism and question glance harmlessly from the objects of the attack. Ministers are well aware that nothing will follow. There will be no vote of censure, and no effectual attempt to curtail their complete liberty of action. The free-lances of Westminster

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are as impotent for practical purposes as the free-lances of Fleet Street. The Cabinet does what seems good to its members, and offers no more explanation than it thinks fit to give. The House of Commons might as well adjourn for the duration of the war for all the practical effect that its discussions can produce.

But though this Cabinet autocracy has reached its consummation during the war, the development has been making steady progress for many years past. Various causes were combining to deprive the legislature of its theoretical authority, and to increase the power of its ruling committee. The British Prime Minister is not only the leader of the House of Commons, and the head of the national Administration, but he is in reality the Chief of the State in the same sense as the President in America and in a much larger sense than the President of the French Republic. He is, of course, subject to the vast and shadowy prerogative of the Crown; but as the King can exercise the prerogative only on the advice of his "Council," and as the Prime Minister and his colleagues are in fact the Council, it is clear that in practice this is no limitation of his authority, but practically an extension of it. There are all kinds of things which ministers can do in the King's name without subjecting themselves to any legal penalties. It is true that if their action does not meet with the concurrence of the House of Commons they can be overthrown by an adverse vote of that assembly. The Ministry has almost a free hand so long as it remains in office; but it can be deprived of office if it fails to please the representatives of the constituencies.

This technical control of Parliament was more effective when ministers were constantly engaged in a struggle to maintain themselves in the House of Commons, and were seldom able to hold their majority together long enough to secure a protracted term of office. But a Ministry, returned after a general election, can now usually rely upon keeping its majority together for the full term of a Parliament. Party discipline is exceedingly strict; and however little a member may approve of any particular measure of his leaders, he will not vote against them when the question is made one of confidence. He has no desire to turn out his own party, and so bring in the Opposition, and perhaps lose his seat and the salary attaching thereto. A majority once obtained may be considered fixed for five years at least. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most effective check on the Cabinet has been the existence of the so-called alternative Cabinet, that is the group of Opposition leaders with the minority of the House behind them, and something like half the electorate as well. This group, though invariably outvoted, can criticise with effect; and its leaders must be treated with a certain deference even by the ruling committee, because there is always the possibility that at the next general election they may be installed in office. Subject, however, to its wholesome respect for the Opposition the Cabinet exercises what is practically irresponsible power between one general election and another. The House of Commons has been elected by the same process which has installed the Cabinet group in office; and every elector in the United Kingdom is well aware that in casting his vote for his local candidate he is really doing his best to place the leader of the Liberal party or the leader of the Conservative party in the position of Prime Minister, President of the United Kingdom of Great Britain, and Chancellor of the British Empire.

The existence of the rival Front Bench has been the salutary check upon the ministerial despotism. But when the two Front Benches combine their forces their is no real check at all. This is what has now happened. In the early part of the war the Conservative Opposition, from patriotic motives, declined to exercise its normal functions of criticism and hostile comment. The party system, which is in fact a necessary, though an unrecognized, part of the British Constitution, went to pieces. There were symptoms of its revival in the Spring of the present year, when an energetic newspaper campaign had drawn attention to the serious deficiencies of the War Office and the Munitions department. At this juncture Mr. Asquith created a coalition Cabinet, and invited the Opposition leaders to join him in the Ministry. Here, then, we have an Administration which "bosses" not only the majority in Parliament, but the minority as well. The faithful Liberal cannot get up to oppose the Cabinet, because that would be opposing his own leaders and the caucus by which he has been elected; and the faithful Unionist is in a similar case. He no more wants to bring discomfiture upon Mr. Balfour than his former rivals wish to inflict a blow upon Mr. Asquith.

Moreover, the Coalition Government has deprived the private members on both sides of their leaders. A British

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ministry, as at present constituted, forms a rather numerous contingent of very well-paid office-holders. There are the twenty-two members of the Cabinet, receiving salaries averaging over $20,000 a year each. Outside this solid little company there is another platoon of minor ministers, under-secretaries, financial secretaries, civil lords of the Admiralty, lords of the Treasury, officers of the Royal Household, and so forth, all of whom have a substantial share of the spoils to the extent of from $5,000 to $10,000 annually. Altogether there are between fifty and sixty party officials who are dependent for their status and their salary on the continued existence of the Ministry. These office-holders include the greater proportion of the men of influence and ability in Parliament. The two Front Benches are the men who have won their way to "Cabinet rank" by long experience or conspicuous talent, while the under-secretaries and the civil lords and the rest are the capable younger men destined in due course to take their places.

If there are any independent members in the House of Commons, and there are some, they are a regiment without officers. Nearly all the leaders or potential leaders have been branded with the official mark, and those that are left are the rank and file, men who do not carry any great weight of authority either within the walls of Westminster or without. The anti-Ministerial campaign has been conducted by one or two Irish and Radical irregulars, by Sir Arthur Markham, a wealthy Liberal coal-owner, who is respected for his courage and independence but not taken very seriously, and by Sir Henry Dalziel, a Radical journalist, who has sat for many years in the House without making any great impression upon it. The head of the Labor party, Mr. Henderson, has been given a Cabinet office; the Ulster leader, Sir Edward Carson, was also brought into the Ministry, though he afterwards left it because of a disagreement with his colleagues over their Balkan policy; and Mr. John Redmond, the Irish Nationalist chief, may almost be called a minister "without portfolio," even though he has preferred to remain outside the Government.

Thus it has come about that the Government is able to treat parliamentary criticism with indifference. Independent members get up in their places and emit pungent comments upon the conduct of the war from time to time; but ministers do not mind, for they know very well that no action

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unfavorable to them is likely to follow. The critics cannot divide the House against the Government. If they made the attempt, the party machine, that is to say in the present case the two party machines, would be set to work and the ministerial majority would be overwhelming. Practically, therefore, the critics of the House of Commons can do no more to affect the policy of the Executive than the critics of the newspapers. In fact, they can do considerably less; for the people do read the newspapers of Lord Northcliffe with their circulation running into millions, whether they agree with them or not; but the speeches of private members of Parliament are given only the briefest summaries in the press, and very few people know that they have been delivered.

It follows that the Cabinet autocracy is virtually unchecked. Finance, legislation, and administration, are disposed of as they please by this all-powerful committee of twenty-two, which is free from the control of public opinion, and which cannot be displaced except as a result of a general election, if even by that; because at the next general election, which probably will not be held until after the close of the war, both party caucuses will be working together to reinstate the present leaders. In reality it is not the Cabinet as a whole which exercises these vast powers. A debating society of twenty-two is much too large to govern, and its present swollen and unprecedented size is only due to the desire to incorporate in it the leading men of all the parties in the House of Commons. The real Government of Britain at this moment is neither the House of Commons nor the Cabinet as a whole, but the small Inner Cabinet, consisting of the Prime Minister and some of his most influential colleagues. Who exactly these persons are is not precisely known, though it has been stated that the actual direction of military affairs from day to day rests with the War Council of five, that is Mr. Asquith himself and Mr. Lloyd George, the leaders of the Liberals, Mr. Balfour and Mr. Bonar Law, the leaders of the Unionists, and Mr. McKenna, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. But outside this War Council there are two or three other ministers, such as Sir Edward Grey, who also belong to the inner ring.

Thus we get a very curious state of affairs. The British Cabinet is technically "unknown to the Constitution." The law has never recognized its existence, and there is no statute or Act of Parliament from which it derives its powers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Legally the executive authority in England is the King-in-Council, that is to say, the King acting by the advice and consent of the members of the Privy Council. It is a mere convention, never embodied in the law, that the only members of his Council whom the King consults are the small number of them who happen to be ministers for the time being. It is also only the result of usage and a curious series of accidents that this committee should sit in secret and carry on the supreme business of the country by private consultation among its members. The British Cabinet is not only a secret committee, but an entirely informal one. It has no secretary, no office, no seal, no permanent location, no means of writing a letter or receiving one in its corporate capacity, and no minute-book. No note is taken of its proceedings at any session, and no record is kept of its decisions. But now, as we have seen, the process of secrecy and informality has been carried a stage further. There is a committee within a committee; and even though we know who are the members of the larger Cabinet we cannot tell who make up the real ruling Council from day to day, and by what members of the supreme Executive the all-important decisions of the moment may be taken. True, the inner committee, like the Cabinet as a whole, is supposed to be responsible to Parliament; but in point of fact the responsibility in either case is extremely vague. In practice at the present moment the governance of England is a kind of dictatorship with the Prime Minister as dictator, calling to his councils from time to time such of his associates as he may think fit to select.

One curious result of this evolution is the emergence of the House of Lords. The Second Chamber, which a few years ago was regarded as a kind of dignified survival, only waiting to be transformed into a senate more in accordance with the democratic idea, has acquired a new importance during the past few months. It has become almost the only arena for independent and authoritative criticism of Administrative acts. The press can be gagged, and, if necessary, muzzled by the censorship. The House of Commons can be ignored, or kept in subjection by the party machinery. But the House of Lords cares little for the party machine, it has no seats to lose at an election, and it retains its right of free speech. Moreover, it contains a considerable body of men of high reputation for statesmanship and experience: men who have governed great dependencies, or have gained

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

distinction in various fields of action, jurists, pro-consuls, captains of industry, and eminent financiers, such men as Lord Bryce, Lord Milner, Lord Cromer, Lord Halsbury, the ex-Lord Chancellor, and Lord Courtney. What these peers have to say is worth hearing, and in the House of Lords they are able to make their voices heard. In consequence the debates in the Upper Chamber are more interesting just now than those in the Commons, and the speeches of the "Elder Statesmen" who take part in its discussions are followed with close attention by the public. It is singular enough that in this crisis of British affairs, while the democratic assembly is powerless and almost unregarded, it is the "Gilded Chamber" of the hereditary aristocracy which succeeds in giving expression to public opinion. Hardly anybody would have predicted that a great war would have conferred a new lease of life and a new sphere of influence upon the House of Lords; but that seems not unlikely to be the case.

SIDNEY LOW.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PERIL OF ESPIONAGE

BY JOHN B. STANCHFIELD

It is a narrow and erroneous—though commonly accepted—conception of the spy which portrays him as an erratic adventurer setting forth in war to discover and ferret out the military moves and plans of the enemy. Indeed, it may be doubted that such a description was ever sufficiently comprehensive, since the spy has in all periods of history operated in times of peace, and his machinations have been employed in diplomatic, political and civil life. To-day, at all events, the work of the secret service agent is certainly not melodramatic. It is rather a prosaic and intensely systematic, business-like occupation, pursued alike in peace and war. Romance has been eliminated from espionage, as it has from war by science and military organization.

Naturally, any estimate of the extent of the activities of foreign espionage in our country in time of peace must be, at least for us laymen, a matter of mere conjecture. The consciousness of danger from this source varies with the temperament of the individual. Some there are who think the peril is negligible, just as these same persons insist that military and naval resources are unnecessary to insure the integrity of our territory and the vindication of our national rights and honor. Others accept with credulity extravagant reports of the existence within our boundaries of organized alien forces ready, at a word from a foreign chancellery, to spring to arms and capture our principal cities.

The sane view, I believe, takes a middle ground and assumes the constant presence here of secret service agents of each of the Great Powers—agents organized and directed with more or less system toward the discovery of all important facts relating to the political, industrial, naval and military conditions of the country. From time to time our daily

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

papers tell us of the apprehension here or there of a foreigner having in his possession drawings of some fortification, or of the mysterious disappearance from the Bureau of Naval Construction of plans connected with the construction of a great battleship. And how many of such incidents fail to reach the light of publicity?

There results, therefore, a deepening conviction that this condition must be met by investigation and correction. But how far in this direction shall we go?

In the first place, whether or not we espouse the cause of the pacifists or of the exponents of preparedness, it would seem to be fundamental that, unless we adopt a policy of complete disarmament, we must at least safeguard the present existing defenses of the country against the covert aggression of espionage. Further, even the advocates of disarmament will not question the urgency of veiling from the scrutiny of the outside world the secret operations of our Government, particularly those of the Department of State.

But this is not all. Besides preventing the discovery of data concerning military affairs and state secrets, we must prepare to meet the danger of the actual destruction by spies of the instrumentalities of our Government and of their positive interference with every kind of internal measure designed for national protection. In this field, moreover, we must not only protect our fortresses and our battleships from mysterious destruction by fire or high explosives; we must also safeguard our national highways and means of communication—our railroads, telegraph and telephone systems, and our wireless apparatus. We must also protect all plants, factories, mills and mines engaged in or available for the production of military or naval ordnance, ammunition, stores or supplies of any kind, and those, as well, which in time of war may be indirectly connected with the military efficiency of the nation. In other words, our system of defense against espionage must embrace three broad departments:

1. The protection of the instrumentalities and operations of the Government itself, its navy and army, its forts, arsenals, and plants, its military, naval and state secrets.

2. The protection of all plants and factories not owned by the Government but directly engaged in the manufacture or production for the Government of ammunition, arms, explosives or other articles used in the conduct of warfare.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. The protection of all agencies and instrumentalities the integrity of which in time of war would become of vital importance to the country. This class includes all factories, plants, mines, mills and other agencies in which any materials are or could be produced which would be necessary in time of war, such as clothing, foodstuffs and steel rails, and also all instrumentalities for transporting troops and war supplies and for transmitting information, such as railroads, telegraph and telephone lines and wireless apparatus.

The President of the United States has himself recently directed attention to the importance of incorporating and amalgamating our privately owned industries into the machinery of national defense and of making them an integral part of that system, by requesting the heads of the various engineering and scientific societies to undertake the work of "collecting data for use in organizing the manufacturing resources of the country for the public service in case of emergency." It is said that in the State of New Jersey alone there are eight hundred plants producing articles that would be needed by the Government in the event of war. This projected systematization of our industries would make it possible rapidly to mobilize these vitally necessary auxiliaries of the national defense. But constant maintenance of the maximum potential value of these elements of defense requires assiduous protection against espionage.

The guarding of these plants and factories involves not only the prevention of their actual physical destruction and the maintenance of secrecy as to their processes and capacity, but also the duty of securing them against paralysis produced by the fomenting of labor strikes and the enticement of workmen.

It was my initial purpose when I undertook the preparation of this paper to devote myself entirely to a consideration of what legislative measures should be adopted to bring about the results which I have outlined. But the more seriously I consider the subject, the more forcibly are there brought to my mind the comparative futility and impotence of punitive legislation as compared with administrative measures looking toward the *prevention* of the activities of espionage. The spy enters upon his undertaking with full notice of the hazards of his venture. He accepts the risks, whatever they are. He is willing, if need be, to pay the penalty of death. He is not deterred, in peace, by provisions of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

penal law any more than he is restrained, in war, by the danger of summary execution. Therefore, besides punishing the offense, let us make it, as far as may be, impossible of commission.

How, then, are we to meet the problem? Three remedies suggest themselves: (1) The adoption of a policy of greater secrecy in connection with matters of national defense; (2) the adoption and development of a system of counter-espionage, in other words, a secret service engaged as a specialty in the occupation of watching and spying upon spies; and (3) punitive legislation.

I cannot express in terms too emphatic my conviction of the necessity of rigorous measures for the enforcement of secrecy in these matters of vital national concern. I firmly believe that this Government cannot too jealously guard the data concerning its military, naval and state affairs. I would recommend a law prohibiting the publication or discussion of any facts or information concerning the national defense except such as are expressly issued for publication by the Government itself. Today, unfortunately, no very ingenious system of espionage is required for the discovery of details of our armed strength. The spy, if he can read English, can ascertain almost all that he desires to know by a perusal of the *Congressional Record* alone.

Liberty to visit our fortresses and our battleships should be curtailed. The affairs of the executive offices of our military, naval and state departments should be more strictly safeguarded. The employes should be rigidly examined before acceptance, and those who handle documents and plans which might be of value to possible enemies of our country should submit to search. Harsh as this measure may seem, an honest and patriotic employe should appreciate its necessity and its value as a protection to himself and his home.

Quite as necessary as these negative precautions is the establishment of a spy system of our own—a force of trained men, preferably connected with the War Department, who will make it their business to know every foreign spy, so that his movements may be a matter of government record. Such a system of counter-espionage exists in practically every European country.

Although the existing laws go further than is ordinarily believed toward the punishment of espionage and its related activities, they are far from sufficiently comprehensive.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Treason and misprision of treason are defined and made punishable, but treason is, unfortunately, limited to levying war against the United States or adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort (U. S. Const. Art 3, Sec. 3; Federal Penal Code, Secs. 1 and 2). We have also on our statute books provisions for the punishment of correspondence with foreign Governments "with an intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign Government . . . in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the Government of the United States" (Fed. Penal Code, Sec. 5); for the punishment of seditious conspiracy to overthrow, put down or to destroy by force the Government of the United States, or to levy war against them, or to oppose by force the authority thereof, or by force to prevent, hinder or delay the execution of any law of the United States, or by force to seize, take or possess any property of the United States contrary to the authority thereof" (id. Sec. 6). The Federal Penal Code punishes also the recruiting of soldiers or sailors within the United States to engage in armed hostility against the United States, and it likewise punishes enlistment for such a purpose (id. Secs. 6 and 7). There are further provisions punishing the act of falsely pretending to be an officer of the United States, and of concealing or embezzling any arms, stores, money or other property of the United States, and punishing bribery and attempted bribery of any officer or official or employe of the United States (id. Secs. 32, 35 and 39). By Section 42 of the Federal Penal Code it is, moreover, made criminal to entice, procure or assist in desertion from the army or navy.

A most suggestive provision of the Penal Code punishes with a fine of not more than $50 or imprisonment for not more than three months, or both, the act of enticing any artificer or workman "retained or employed in any arsenal or armory to depart from the same during the continuance of his engagement or to avoid or break his contract with the United States" (Sec. 43). But this provision is limited to plants actually owned and operated by the United States.

Physical injury to fortifications or other military or naval works is punished with a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than five years, or both (id. Sec. 44). Similarly, injury to telegraph, telephone or cable systems is punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000 or im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prisonment for not more than three years, or both, but only when such systems are operated or controlled by the United States (id. Sec. 60). Arson of buildings or works, the property of the United States, is punishable by a fine of $5,000 and imprisonment for twenty years (id. Sec. 286).

With the exception of the sections punishing injury to the military or naval works or other property of the United States, and those relating to the enticement of desertion or the enticement of workmen from Federal shops, these penal provisions, over which I have cursorily passed, are not directed specifically or intentionally to the prevention or punishment of the acts which are embraced within the meaning of the word "espionage." It is only because the spy frequently finds it necessary, in order to accomplish his purpose, to resort to the commission of what we may call an ordinary crime, that he brings himself within the purview of those more or less general provisions.

Before the year 1909 there seems to have been no statute, aside of course from the Articles of War, for the punishment of spying as such. In that year there was enacted what is now Sec. 45 of the Federal Penal Code, punishing with fine and imprisonment the unlawful entry upon any fort, military reservation or army post. Finally, in 1911, there was passed a law entitled "An act to prevent the disclosure of national defense secrets" (Act of March 3, 1911, Chap. 226; 36 Stat. at L. 1084), now Sections 45a and 45b of the Federal Penal Code. These two sections attempt to cover the entire subject of obtaining unlawful information respecting the national defense. The first punishes, with imprisonment for one year, or a fine of $1,000, or both, any person who—

(1) For the purpose of obtaining information respecting the national defense, to which he is not lawfully entitled, goes upon any vessel or enters any navy yard, naval station, fort, battery, torpedo station, arsenal, camp, factory, building, office or other place connected with the national defense, owned or constructed or in process of construction by the United States, or in the possession or under the control of the United States or any of its authorities or agents;

(2) When lawfully or unlawfully upon any vessel or in or near any such place, without proper authority, obtains, takes or makes, or attempts to obtain, take or make any document, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, plan, model or knowledge of anything connected with the national defense to which he is not entitled;

(3) Without proper authority receives or obtains, or undertakes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or agrees to receive or obtain from any person any such document, sketch, photograph, etc., knowing the same to have been so obtained, taken or made;

(4) Having possession of or control over any such document, sketch, photograph, etc., willfully and without proper authority, communicates or attempts to communicate the same to any person not entitled to receive it, or to whom the same ought not in the interest of the national defense be communicated at that time; or

(5) Being lawfully intrusted with any such document, sketch, photograph, etc., willfully and in breach of his trust, so communicates or attempts to communicate the same.

Section 45b provides that anyone who has committed an offense under the preceding section, and who communicates or attempts to communicate to any foreign Government any of the documents or information so obtained or intrusted to him, shall be imprisoned for not more than ten years.

Even with the specially added provisions to which I have just referred, the existing laws are entirely inadequate to meet or cope with the activities of espionage. The entire body or system of legislation is unsound in principle and deficient in scope.

The sections relating to the surreptitious obtaining of information concerning the national defense do not recognize any distinction whatever between the procurement of such information by an alien spy in the employ of a foreign Government and the communication or betrayal of such secrets by a citizen or by an official of the Government to whom they have been intrusted. Manifestly there is a great moral and ethical distinction between these two acts. The former, though injurious to our national interests, involves little or no turpitude, for the alien resident owes us legally but a qualified allegiance and morally little if any duty. The latter is a flagrant violation of a sacred obligation, if not literally of the oath of allegiance to the nation. My first suggestion, therefore, is that our legislation on this subject should differentiate between such acts, even if of the same character, when committed by aliens and when committed by citizens. When done by an alien, the act should be punishable as one of espionage; when perpetrated by a national, it should be punishable as treachery. We cannot, without a Constitutional amendment, make such an act, especially when committed in times of peace, an act of treason, because the Constitutional definition of treason is exclusive. But there would seem to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be no reason why Congress can not classify such acts and give them the name of treachery. Moreover, I believe that the punishment of such treachery should be more severe in the case of an official, who would thereby commit a breach of an express trust, than in the case of a citizen who has no connection with the national defense.

And further, in the case of persons intrusted with the safeguarding of national secrets or property, the legislature should constitute it a crime negligently to permit such secrets to fall into the possession of unauthorized persons, or such property to be damaged, destroyed or illegally removed. An official or employee of the United States should be held to a more strict accountability than that merely for positive wrongdoing or breach of trust. Such an official should, on the contrary, be charged affirmatively with the safety of the secrets or property committed to his care.

In the next place, I believe that the theory of punishing misprision of treason should be extended so as to apply to acts of espionage and treachery as above defined. In other words, the law should make it criminal for a person within the United States, having knowledge or reasonable ground to believe that such an offense is about to be or has been committed, not to make prompt report to the proper officers.

To recapitulate the foregoing suggestions, they are:

1. The differentiation between espionage and treachery.

2. The creation of an offense which, for brevity, we may call misprision of espionage or misprision of treachery.

3. The creation of an offense of criminal negligence in guarding the nation's secrets and property.

There still remains to be considered the kind of activities against which the laws on this subject shall be directed; in other words, the scope and extent of the legislation to be constructed in conformity with these legal principles. Our present legislation fails entirely to protect the secrets, documents and archives of the Department of State, and the factories, mines, railroads and other privately owned properties which, in the event of war, would be most intimately connected with the national defense. There must, therefore, be an enlargement of the scope of the statutes which punish the obtaining of information concerning the national defense and which punish physical injury to forts, factories and armories of the United States, the enticement of desertion from the army or navy, and the enticement of workmen or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

artisans from the arsenals or factories of the United States.

All governmental records should be included within the purview of the statute relating to the improper procurement of information—the secrets of the Department of State and the data about to be collected with respect to the organization of the national resources, as well as all military and naval secrets. Also, we must punish any interference with privately owned plants, factories, mills, mines, railroads or other enterprises engaged, or which have been or may be engaged in the construction, manufacture or transportation of any arms or ammunition or stores for the army or navy, and also any interference with our privately operated telegraph, cable and telephone lines and wireless systems. With the completion of the planned systematization of our manufacturing and industrial resources, it should be possible to draft a law defining with sufficient particularity the agencies of this character relating to the national defense. But if such a statute is found inadvisable, I would suggest a provision of penal law prohibiting in general terms any interference with plants, factories or other enterprises connected with the national defense, and authorizing the Secretary of War to designate from time to time such plants, factories and enterprises as, by reason of their activities or the adaptability of their machinery or other features, are in fact connected with the national defense. These agencies so designated by public proclamation would then come automatically within the intendment and purview of the general statute. Further, with respect to such plants, any law on the subject should punish not only actual physical injury, but also any interference with the sources of supply, either of materials or implements or of labor. In thus forbidding interference with labor, the suggested measure would be an enlargement of the present provision relating to the enticement of workmen from Federal factories and arsenals. Of course, any statute designed to effect this purpose would be carefully framed so as to condemn not the ordinary industrial strikes, but only interference with labor when brought about with the intent to embarrass the measures of the Government.

There will arise, of course, the query as to how far Congress may go in the direction of my suggestions without transcending its Constitutional limitations. In so far as legislation is required in order to protect privately owned means of transportation and communication, the interstate com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

merce clause of the Constitution is ample to empower Congress to enact the necessary measures. The other proposed subjects of legislation, it is pertinent to consider, are embraced within the following powers expressly conferred upon Congress by the Constitution:

> 12. To raise and support armies . . . ;
> 13. To provide and maintain a navy;
> 14. To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;
> 15. To provide for calling forth the militia;
> 16. To provide for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia;
> 17. To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district . . . as may . . . become the seat of government of the United States; and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by consent of the legislature of the state in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock yards and other needful buildings; and
> 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this constitution in the government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof. (Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 8.)

In addition to these express powers, the Government of the United States, like any government, has, inherently, the power to maintain and preserve its own integrity.

The only suggestion which, in my opinion, would raise even a debatable Constitutional point is that relating to the protection of privately owned plants and factories which are or can be used for the national defense. In so far as the statute may be able specifically to mention or accurately to define plants then in use for the manufacture or construction of supplies necessary for national defense, I can see no Constitutional objection, for without the right to protect the agencies engaged in the production of munitions or supplies of war, the Government would not be able to "provide and maintain a navy" or to "raise and support armies." With respect to a general provision covering factories and plants to be designated from time to time by the Secretary of War, there may be some question, but I think that upon study such a provision will be found to be Constitutional. The possible objection would be that an attempt to vest such a power in the Secretary of War is unconstitutional in permitting an executive officer to exercise the function of legislation. But

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this ground does not appeal to my reason. The legislature defines the offense as interference with a plant connected with the national defense, and it places upon the Secretary of War merely the duty of proclaiming the existence of the facts with respect to such factories or plants as are in truth connected with the national defense. There is some precedent for such a law. In the case of our reciprocity treaties, the President is authorized by proclamation to declare the existence of such a state of facts as will bring into effect a reduction of our tariff rates. Again, in the case of the administration of our immigration laws, administrative officers are invested with the power of determining whether incoming aliens are or are not desirable citizens, and the decisions of the immigration officers are not reviewable by the courts, but are conclusive, except where there has been such flagrant abuse of discretion that it can be said that the officials have entirely failed to attempt a compliance with the law.

However, if the Constitutionality of any part of the proposed legislation should be deemed doubtful, I believe that the exigencies of the situation warrant a Constitutional amendment. The necessity of legislation to protect our privately owned enterprises must be manifest. In times of peace a shoe factory or a plant engaged in the manufacture of clothing, having especially developed facilities for the production of army stores and supplies, may not have a single government contract, and would therefore be at the mercy of a system of spies intent upon the demoralization of its labor force or the actual physical destruction of its machinery. If the Secretary of War were empowered to designate such a plant as one connected with the national defense, this factory could be protected by the Federal Secret Service and by the proposed system of counter-espionage.

Without some comprehensive scheme of this character for the protection of our industrial auxiliaries of national defense, the nation will always be vulnerable. If a thoroughly organized system of espionage is to be able to destroy, or to entice workmen from, our privately owned ammunition plants and from our copper mines, and to foment strikes and industrial disorders in our railroads and to cripple our means of communication, we shall be utterly at the mercy of a foreign enemy, no matter how strong or well protected from secret scrutiny may be the actual military and naval arms of the Government.

JOHN B. STANCHFIELD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DISTRIBUTION OF INCOMES

BY W. H. MALLOCK

THE ideas prevalent as to the modern distribution of wealth, which underlie the arguments of extreme social reformers, have been mainly derived from economic and social thinkers who either neglected statistical methods altogether, or who flourish when these methods were at a stage much less advanced than that which they have now reached. The import of such ideas is that in modern countries, of which the most conspicuous examples are America and the United Kingdom, the bulk of the national income, in proportion as its total increases, tends to pass into the hands of a small and super-opulent class, the vast majority of the citizens being left in a condition of absolutely or relatively increasing poverty. Such, for example, was the teaching, still constantly quoted, of Mill. It was the teaching of Marx. It was the teaching of Henry George. But Mill made no attempt to translate his vague assertions into any definite and statistical form whatever. The statistical computations of Marx were, as a later Socialist writer has said of them, no more scientific than the physical speculations of Thales; whilst, according to Henry George, the nature of the case was so obvious that statistical investigation of any kind was unnecessary.

But since the days of George, to say nothing of those of Marx and Mill, statistical methods have very greatly improved; and it has gradually become more and more evident how fundamentally at variance with fact these traditional ideas with regard to the distribution of wealth are. The statistics of distribution are still in a very imperfect state. Much, however, has been learned in the course of the past twenty-five years; and one of the greatest advances made in statistical method has been the development of the method

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of international comparison. In a work recently published, namely *The Wealth and Income of the People of the United States,* by Dr. W. I. King, Instructor in Statistics in the University of Wisconsin, materials have been brought together which have, for comparative purposes, even more significance than the writer himself recognizes; and it is my object in these few pages to call attention to some of the more important of them, supplementing them with certain others.

One of the most important comparisons which the work of Dr. King suggests is that between America and the United Kingdom. Dr. King divides his subject into two parts, one being the distribution of what he calls "wealth," by which he means exclusively permanent property or capital, the other being the distribution of incomes. This use of the term "wealth" is perhaps not very fortunate; for wealth in the popular mind is less closely associated with capital than it is with spendable income; and millions of men may be earning large incomes by work who would, in Dr. King's language, have no wealth whatsoever. Indeed he admits that such is the case himself, and that the net results of distribution in any country are mainly to be looked for in the distribution of the means by which life may be enjoyed, rather than of shares in farm lands, of factory walls, and of machinery. We will, therefore, confine ourselves here to the distribution of incomes; and, before dealing with the figures for the United States as Dr. King gives them, certain others shall be summarized which he omits, though by implication he often alludes to them. These are figures relating to the United Kingdom. Of the distribution of capital, or capital values in that country, he gives a tabular account. He gives no corresponding account of the distribution of incomes. His figures for the United States are brought down to the year 1910. In dealing with the United Kingdom it will be convenient to take the year 1907 and the years adjoining, because with regard to that particular period the available evidence is more than usually ample.

Two methods of computation, each independent of the other, united to show that in the year 1907 the income of the United Kingdom was approximately 10,500 million dollars. There was also direct evidence to show the aggregate amounts of two groups of incomes respectively—namely those at the top of the scale, which exceeded 25,000 dollars a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

year, and those at the bottom, which did not exceed 800. With regard to the intermediate groups an index is to be found in the official records of houses, as classified and enumerated in accordance with their rental values, rent being taken to represent on an average from one-eighth to one-twelfth of the incomes of their respective occupiers. If, then, on the basis of such evidences we divide incomes into the following classes: (1) Those not exceeding 2,500 dollars a year; (2) those between 2,500 dollars and 5,000 dollars; (3) those between 5,000 dollars and 25,000; and (4) those exceeding 25,000, the respective aggregates of these groups will have been as follows:

Amount of individual incomes.	Aggregate in millions of dollars.	Approximate percentage of total.
Up to 2,500 dollars.....	8,200	78
2,500 to 5,000.....	700	7
5,000 to 25,000.....	950	9
Exceeding 25,000.....	650	6
	10,500	

Now as to the idea common amongst extreme reformers that the bulk of the national income, in any modern country, is swallowed up by a minority called "the rich," it must be observed that "rich" is a term the meaning of which is relative. But when we recollect that "the rich," as described in popular oratory, are identified by Marx with "great factory lords," that an English radical statesman has recently described them as the lords of "piled up aggregations," and that they are invariably typified in Socialist caricatures in America by species of bloated ogre as hugging or staggering under sacks each labeled "5,000,000 dollars," we shall be justified in assuming that "the rich," as the reformers imagine them, can hardly be persons with less than 25,000 dollars a year. We shall at all events (as I have pointed out elsewhere) be straining the implications of the word to their utmost, if we take it that these monstrous plutocrats are a band none of whose members has incomes of less than 5,000 dollars. If, then, we adopt this latter and absurdly comprehensive definition, we shall see from the above table that the actual share of "the rich" in the income of the United Kingdom, instead of forming any preponder-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ant part of it, was at the date in question little more than one-seventh, whilst the sole class which really represents the popular conception of riches took, as a matter of fact, hardly more than one-seventeenth.

Now, the figures just given, except those relating to the largest incomes and the lowest, in view of the evidence on which they are founded, might, if they stood alone, be made the subject of more or less sceptical criticism. It might also be urged—and this is a more important matter—that, even if substantially correct, they relate to the affairs of one country only, and possess no general significance. Let us, then, turn to Dr. King's tables relating to the distribution of incomes in the United States, and see how the affairs of one country throw light on those of another.

In the year 1910 the entire income of the Continental United States was in round figures 30,500 million dollars, and if we start with dividing this into four groups of incomes, classified as they have just been classified in the case of the United Kingdom, their respective amounts, according to Dr. King's tables, are as follows:

Incomes up to 2,500 dollars	23,000 million dollars
2,500 to 5,000	2,100 million dollars
5,000 to 25,000	3,000 million dollars
Exceeding 25,000	2,400 million dollars

Let us now take the case of Prussia, which, says Dr. King, is the European country which provides us with the best data for a comparison. The figures, as Dr. King groups them, do not completely coincide with the grouping that has been here adopted with regard to America and the United Kingdom, for the lowest of the Prussian groups, as shown in his synopsis, consists of incomes up to about 2,400 dollars instead of 2,500, and no comparable division is made between incomes ranging from 2,500 dollars to 25,000; but, these discrepancies being allowed for, the comparative results are remarkable. The income of Prussia in the year 1910 was, according to Dr. King's tables, made up as follows:

Incomes up to 2,400 dollars	4,500 million dollars
2,400 to 25,000	875 million dollars
Exceeding 25,000	310 million dollars

Let us now take the three countries together, and express in each case the income of each group in terms of percent-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ages of the total, as has been done already in the case of the United Kingdom:

Range of Incomes.	Approximate percentage of total income. United Kingdom	United States	Prussia
Up to 2,500 dollars.....	78	76	78½
2,500 to 5,000.....	7	7	16
5,000 to 25,000.....	9	9	
Exceeding 25,000[1].....	6	8	5½

The close similarity of these three sets of figures—figures worked out in three different countries by independent investigators dealing with different data—forms a striking confirmation of the substantial accuracy of each. Not only does it exhibit the radical fallacy of the belief that income in modern countries passes mainly into the hands of the rich, but it also disposes of the idea that distribution in any one country is the result of local accident, and shows that it is and must be determined by some general principle, to which certain human activities, wherever they operate, naturally and necessarily conform. And that such is the case will become more and more evident, if, still using Dr. King's figures for America, we carry our comparison of these with the figures for the United Kingdom further.

Dr. King in his tables for America deals with family incomes, and not with incomes received by and legally pertaining to individuals. Thus, whereas the total number of persons "gainfully occupied" was 37 million, the total number of family incomes with which he deals was 28 million. But this procedure practically affects his figures in the case of those families only whose joint incomes (mainly consisting of wages) did not exceed 1,400 dollars. It appears that in cases such as these a family whose joint income was as much as 1,200 or 1,400 dollars would comprise on an average one principal worker whose earnings reached, but did not exceed, 800 dollars. Dr. King expressly says that in this respect the figures can represent no more than a rough approximation to the truth; but they will enable us, if we so accept them, to make a very interesting comparison between such incomes and incomes below a certain limit in the United Kingdom; for if the sum of American family incomes not exceeding

[1] Dr. King mentions in a note that the figures given by him for this group of incomes may possibly be excessive. Should this prove to be the case, the parallelism between the United States and the United Kingdom would be even closer than that represented above.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1,200 or 1,400 dollars represent individual incomes not exceeding 800 dollars, the sum of such incomes in America will correspond to the sum of such incomes in the United Kingdom as are not subject to income-tax. The sum of these last was in the year 1907, about 6,500 million dollars out of a total income of 10,500, or, in other words, just short of 62 per cent. According to Dr. King's figures, the sum of family incomes in America not exceeding 1,400 dollars was, in the year 1910, 19,200 million dollars, or 62¾ per cent of a total income of 30,500 dollars.

Another example may be given, taken at random, showing the similarity of the results reached by independent methods of computation. In the year 1907 there were in Great Britain and Ireland about 130,000 houses the rental values of which ranged from 250 dollars to 300, and which are roughly computed to represent the same number of families, their incomes ranging from 2,700 or 2,800 dollars to 3,400. In the United States, as shown in Dr. King's tables, the number of incomes lying between the same limits was about 230,000; the two numbers being in almost the same ratio as that borne by the population of one country to the population of the other; whilst the aggregate of such incomes was 3½ per cent of the total in the United Kingdom, in the United States, according to Dr. King's figures, it was about 3¼ per cent. We need not insist on such similarities too strictly, but they are evidently very close. A similarity yet more significant is one of an allied though not identical kind.

According to the idea which prevails generally, the distribution of incomes is what is called "pyramidal." This means that, if incomes be grouped in accordance with their magnitude, the smallest will be the most numerous, the number decreasing in proportion as the amount increases. Now, as I have pointed out elsewhere, if Socialist theories of modern society be true, this is not only what does happen: it is also what is bound to happen until the present structure of society is altogether revolutionized. In every modern country, so the Socialist argument runs, the masses work for wages which are doled out to them by an employer; and the amount which they receive for their work is in every case the subject of a bargain, in which each party aims at doing the best he can for himself. Now, if the two parties met on equal terms the result would be substantially equitable. The worker would get from the employer as much as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his work was worth. The terms, however, on which they actually meet are in their very essence unequal. The wage-earner has nothing to sell but the faculties of his mind and body. He must, therefore, sell these faculties from week to week, or he will starve. The employer can afford to wait; and he thus can compel the wage-earner to accept a price which bears no relation to the value of the product of the work performed by him, but is simply determined by the minimum which will keep the wage-earner alive. Socialists, it is true, have of late years found themselves unable to deny that certain small sections of the wage-earners have contrived to secure something more than mere starvation wages; but they still maintain that, with regard to the great majority, the tendency of the existing system is to beat wages down to a common, and to the lowest possible, level. Now, if we examine (as by means of contemporary records we can do) the case of England at the beginning of the nineteenth century, we find a condition of things which does more or less coincide with the picture which such theorists draw. The great majority of the adult male workers barely earned as much as two-and-a-half dollars a week; a small minority earned three dollars; those who earned three-and-a-half dollars were a minority smaller still. About fifty years later, however, an English statistician noted, as a mere empirical fact, that this scheme of distribution appeared to be undergoing a change, and that larger incomes up to a certain point were increasing in number, while the numbers of the smaller were declining. Since that time the change, which relates almost exclusively to incomes earned as wages, has become more and more pronounced, and may be roughly expressed thus: If we suppose the wage-earners to be divided into five groups, the individual earnings in each of which are indicated respectively by the numerals 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, the number of the typical composition of a staff of a hundred men in England, in the year 1800, have been more or less like this: Group 3, would have comprised 75 men; Group 4, 15 men; Group 5, 5 men; Group 6, 3 men, and Group 7, 2 men. A hundred years later the typical composition of a similar staff of men would have been more or less like this: Group 3, would have comprised 75 men; Group 4a, 5 men; Group 4, 10 men; Group 5, 75 men; Group 6, 7 men, and Group 7, 3 men. These figures, though they broadly correspond with facts, must not be taken as representing facts in detail. They

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are given only as indicating the general character of a change which has taken place first in England, and subsequently in the United Kingdom between the beginning of the nineteenth century and today. It is a change which affects wage-incomes up to a certain limit, that limit being approximately 480 dollars. Earnings above that sum revert to the traditional order, and decrease in number in proportion as they increase in magnitude. Such being the case with regard to the United Kingdom, the remarkable fact which we are here concerned to note is that a parallel scheme of distribution has developed itself in America likewise. Incomes—mainly wage-incomes—up to 800 dollars, are divided in Dr. King's tables into seven groups, beginning with 200 dollars, and rising above one another in steps of 100 dollars each. The number of incomes in the lowest group is 20,000; in the second, 270,000; in the third, 1,700,000; in the fourth and fifth, 2,600,000, and in the sixth and seventh, 3,500,000. Then we come to an eighth group, consisting of incomes between 800 and 900 dollars, the number of which is 2,700,000; then to incomes between 900 dollars and 1,000, the number of which is 2,200,000; then to incomes between 1,000 dollars and 1,100 the number of which is 1,800,000; and so on till we reach the upper end of the scale. What, then, is the meaning of these facts which are, in their general character, common to both countries?

What gives to these facts their peculiar interest is this—that they entirely refute the Socialist and ultra-radical doctrine with regard to the nature of the bargaining which takes place between the modern wage-earner and the employer. They demonstrate that whatever may be the price which the former pays the latter for his work, it is not determined (except in a minute number of cases) by the minimum on which a man can live. It is the very essence of the Socialist argument that the employer will never pay more than such a minimum if by any means he can avoid doing so—that whenever he does so, he does so against the grain. Why, then, if the employers of America can get some 300,000 workers for less than 300 dollars a year, do they pay 1,700,000 at the rate of 400 dollars? Why, if they can get 1,700,000 at the rate of 400 dollars, do they pay 2,600,000 at the rate of 500? And then, again, there comes the converse question, Why, if the employers of America can be obliged to pay 3,500,000 workers at the rate of 800 dollars a year, can only 1,800,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workers get out of them as much as 1,100 dollars, and only 710,000 as much as 1,400 dollars? The absolute figures for America and the United Kingdom differ; but the nature of the phenomena is in both countries identical. What is the explanation of them? There is only one explanation possible.[1] It is this, that wage-prices are determined by the very factor the operation of which the theory of socialism denies. It is true that so far as the consciousness of the two parties —the wage-earner and the employer—is concerned, the price is determined by the process of isolated bargainings, but the results of such bargainings are in each case determined by the value of the work done—a value which varies with the faculties of the men employed; and though they may not always coincide with this value absolutely, they necessarily gravitate towards and are never very far away from it.

It will, however, be asked why, if such is the case, this scheme of wage-distribution, which is peculiar to the modern world, did not prevail a hundred years ago, when the whole industrial process was simpler than it is today; for the congenital faculties of the human race were presumably the same in the eighteenth century as they they were in the nineteenth, as they are now in the twentieth. And the answer to this question is that, as the industrial process has become more and more highly intellectualized, demands have arisen and opportunities have been created for the exercise of a variety of faculties which, though they were always latent in men, were previously undeveloped because there was no industrial use for them; and these, being now developed in response to a novel demand for them, exhibit themselves in a series of graded efficiencies, each of which finds its index in the rate of wages paid for it, just as a man's clothes are an index of his height and figure. Moreover, the distribution of wages conforms to the same scheme in one country as in another, because everywhere the potential efficiencies with which men are born are distributed by nature in very much the same way.

It is impossible, within the limits of these few pages, to discuss this question of the international distribution of wages in detail. It must be enough for the moment to point

[1] It has been suggested that this phenomenon may be accounted for by the fact that the lower rates of wages are those earned by women. Dr. King's analysis shows that this is not so. The scheme of distribution in question is specially notable in the case of married men.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out that the principle of distribution, as above indicated, does not apply to the wages of manual work only. It applies to the reward of effort of all kinds. In the first place it applies to salaries, which are the reward of mental work, such as that of the clerk, the supervisor, the manager. The growth of this class, intermediate between the employers and the manual workers, is a purely modern phenomenon. It can be traced with some accuracy in the United Kingdom for at least a hundred years. In that country the number of these subordinate mental workers has increased three times as fast as the population, whereas the number of the manual workers relatively to the population has declined. The growth of this class is the outward and visible sign of that intellectualization of industry, of which, under the employers, it is the instrument, and is intelligible only when regarded in this light. Its growth can be traced in America for a short time only; and if it be taken as a whole, Dr. King observes that statistical details with regard to it are still very defective; but if we confine ourselves to the records of "factory establishments" since the beginning of the present century, it will be found that the situation in America has become by this time essentially the same as it is in the United Kingdom. The subordinate mental workers have so increased at the expense of the manual that the proportion of the one class to the other is now in both countries similar, and in both countries the average earnings of the mental worker bear practically the same ratio to the average earnings of the manual, the amount of the former being in each case about twice that of the latter.

Finally, with regard to those who are neither salaried workers nor wage-earners, though a difference in the methods of classification adopted in the two countries renders direct comparisons of a detailed kind difficult, the net results of distribution coincide so closely that these must evidently be due to the action of the same pervading principle. The distribution of income, and the distribution of efficiency, must on the whole (though there will naturally be exceptions) coincide within narrow limits. In the American Tables all occupied persons other than wage-paid or salaried workers are classed together as "entrepreneurs"; but since, as Dr. King observes, some of these persons make "princely incomes," while the average income of an "entrepreneur" is hardly twice that of a skilled mechanic, it is evident that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most of these cannot, in the ordinary sense of the word, be "employers" at all. The typical employer of today can hardly be a person making less than 5,000 dollars a year; and since the total of incomes exceeding that sum is, both in America and the United Kingdom, only about 15 per cent. of the total, the "employers," even if they managed to take twice as much as was due to them, would diminish the incomes of the great mass of the people by not more than 7½ per cent. As matters stand, the close similarity in the distribution of these larger incomes from 5,000 dollars up to those exceeding 25,000 in America, the United Kingdom, and in Prussia also, is in itself sufficient to indicate, without closer study, that the coincidence of income with efficiency of some sort or other is a law which prevails throughout the distributive system from the bottom of the scale to the top. The exceptions (if such there are) which would most readily occur to an objector, would naturally be those incomes of colossal magnitude which are practically peculiar to America, and are of more or less recent origin—namely, those exceeding 2,000,000 dollars. But these, though they make their recipients the talk of half the world, are not so much as one-hundred-and-twentieth part of the income of people of the United States; therefore, for purposes of imagined redistribution, it makes very little matter whether we take them into account or no. If, however, these world-famous incomes being excluded, we concern ourselves with the larger group consisting of incomes in excess of 25,000 dollars, the proportion of these to the total will be very nearly the same in the United States, the United Kingdom and Prussia—that is to say, about 6 per cent. The similarity goes yet deeper: for the distribution of incomes within the limits of this group is in the first two countries nearly the same likewise, and would probably prove to be in Prussia were the data for a comparison available.

It is impossible here to pursue this subject further; but the outstanding facts which have been thus briefly noted are sufficient to show how widely different is the distribution of incomes in the modern world from the conceptions of it which are most popular, and how much more complex, more general, and more deeply seated are the causes to which its distribution is due than those which alone figure in the crude theories of Marxian, and even of later, socialism.

W. H. Mallock.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TARIFF COMMISSION PLAN: ITS FACTS AND FALLACIES

BY JAMES B. REYNOLDS

In most quarters of the United States the idea of a Tariff Commission is received with applause. But much of this enthusiasm is based upon a mistaken idea, though one that circulates with great gusto. The people really believe that by the creation of a Commission they will be eliminating politics from the tariff. There is no better slogan than "Take the Tariff Out of Politics." Nor is there any more misleading. When people are taken out of politics, when oxygen is taken out of the air, when several things of that kind occur, then there will be an absolute divorce of politics and tariff, and not before. It cannot happen before that time, for the tariff is the great economic question of the nation, and being such is something for the country itself to decide. What kind of a tariff is to be made is settled at the polls, and will be until the end of the present chapter.

There is also prevalent the idea that a Tariff Commission will settle all tariff trouble, that its influence will in some mysterious way bring together the man who regards a protective tariff as a deity and the one who regards it as a devil, and make lion and lamb lie down together in a pasture of harmony. Such a commission is looked upon by far too many people as a kind of philosopher's stone by means of which prices can be made high for those who wish them high and at the same time low for those who wish them low. It is felt that such a body could equally satisfy the wants of those who wish nothing but American-made goods sold in the United States, and those who disdain to use anything that is not made abroad. The things that a commission can accomplish, according to some of the advocates of it, make up a splendid picture, glorious in color and utopian in sig-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nificance. But, alas, such a picture possesses many of the qualities of a mirage, and vanishes into air under the sunlight of scrutiny.

This does not mean, however, that a Tariff Commission is not a good thing, that it cannot be made of real benefit to the country. It can do such and can be made such, but only with a real appreciation of its natural and proper limitations. The Tariff Commission idea, as a matter of fact, has been sadly injured and its permanent creation postponed by what has gone on in the house of its friends. It has been regarded there and proclaimed abroad as a worker of miracles, instead of being invested with merely normal and possible functions. It has been demanded that upon it be conferred the power to make rates. Many of its ardent friends have insisted that it be made like unto the Interstate Commerce Commission, and given the same power over tariff duties that that body has over freight rates. But the matter of what shippers shall pay to the railroads for carrying freight, and what rates of duty a foreign producer shall pay for the privilege of selling his goods in the American market-place, are very dissimilar things, and must be handled in totally different fashion.

It was this demand for kingly power for a Tariff Commission that hurt the cause. It aroused Congress and the American producer and the foreign importer to vigorous protest and to open hostility. Congress has never yet been in a mood to give away the tariff-making initiative and power conferred upon it by the Constitution, and there is no symptom that any such mood will come into being. It was the fear that a Tariff Commission would attempt this trespass upon its power that kept Congress from passing legislation to create any such body. Had the advocates of a commission been less extravagant in their demands, there would not have been the same antagonism to overcome.

There are those who base a great part of their enthusiasm for a Tariff Commission on what European nations do in this regard. More correctly, they base it upon what they *think* European nations do. As a matter of fact, the European tariff commission system is very different from the popular notion of it in this country, and a further important element in the case is that the tariff-making methods of the United States and foreign countries are so different

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that it would be almost impossible for them to proceed on parallel tracks. Tariff-making in Europe does not involve the preliminary and basic discussion of what kind of a tariff it is to be. There is no three-cornered contest as to whether the new law shall be one for protection, for revenue only, or for that newly arrived tariff theory of Mr. Underwood's, a competitive tariff. In all the European countries where the tariff commission idea is prevalent, the one theory upon which tariffs are made is the direct and personal benefit to the country making it. Nor does a new tariff law follow upon the heels of a national election in which the party in power has been changed. Their tariffs are made to fit the needs of the nation, and are not the sequence of a political victory. Since there is no dispute as to what shall be the basic theory of a new tariff law, it remains only for those making it to do the detailed work, and to see that each industry of the nation receives fair play and just treatment.

An important difference in the tariff situation in the United States, as compared with other countries, is the very important parliamentary one. Under the procedure of most European countries, important measures are carefully prepared, either by officers of the Government or those whom such officers select, and then these measures go before the parliamentary body with the backing of the Administration and the full force of Government support. Furthermore, the original tariffs, in the case of many countries, are not intended to go into practical force, but to serve merely as a basis for the making of commercial treaties with other countries. For this reason, the part played by an Administration abroad is the one that dominates the entire tariff situation. The detailed discussion on the floor of parliamentary bodies is much less important, and it is merely a question of the Administration securing sufficient support from a parliament to secure the passage of a tariff which it has itself framed. This is, of course, absolutely contrary to the practice under our own form of government. Theoretically, at least, Congress is independent both of the President and of the Administration, although this independence varies with the years, and runs the whole scale from fact to fiction.

As a matter of fact, no country of Europe has yet established such a body as the Tariff Commission would be in the United States. There is no other nation in which an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

investigation of industrial conditions, as started by the former Tariff Board with its extended examination of costs of production, has been conducted. The European method of tariff commissioning does not involve this direct and thorough system of inquiry, this sending of field agents to learn facts at first hand and at close range. The European method has been in the nature of frequent and friendly conferences with all the interests concerned, while the consumers have been represented by the government officials themselves. There is no formal governmental body which holds formal hearings, and there is no making public of the testimony that is given at these conferences.

When the last French tariff was made, it was entrusted to a commission of many members, largely made up of manufacturers of a widely divergent mass of products, and of men who would be vitally concerned in the new rates of duty. This commission spent several years in framing a tariff bill, and then presented it in its entirety as a Government measure in the French Chamber of Deputies. In Germany, there is a large committee which, in the preparation of the last tariff, was very active at a certain stage of the proceedings, and this committee is sometimes referred to in America as the German Tariff Commission. This body, however, which numbered thirty-six, was primarily an advisory body, made up of the great leaders in the industrial world, and its members were men of large affairs, working for a trivial sum per diem, and devoting most of their time to their own personal business. The assistance which they rendered to the Government in the making of the law was because of their experience as business men, not because of any special investigation which they undertook.

In Austria, in the making of tariffs, the Government receives assistance from a committee of the associated Chambers of Commerce, which attempts to straighten out beforehand the conflicting demands of the producing interests, and present to the Government a plan which has the support of the business world. This body represents, primarily, the producing interests, and is in no sense the determining factor in the making of the tariff. In both Austria and Germany, the real responsibility is placed in the hands of the officials of the different ministries. To such officials the tariff question can be safely left, in which again there is a radical difference between the situation there and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

here. There are Government officials in European countries who have devoted themselves solely to the industrial effects of the tariff for a period of many years, and are, therefore, familiar in a personal and practical way with the facts regarding costs and competition in the different industries.

In the case of the United States, with the changing of officials consequent upon the incoming of the different Administrations, there is no such force upon which to rely, and, consequently, it becomes necessary to do work all over again each time a tariff law is changed. So it is not safe to transplant bodily from Europe a tariff-making system that is of value there, because of the vastly different type of soil in the United States in which tariff seeds are sown, and from which tariff bills sprout forth.

The forerunner of the Tariff Commission that is to be was the Tariff Board. That was an institution to which Congress never gave its real sanction. It did, however, relent from its spirit of antagonism to the idea of the Board's existence sufficiently to give it necessary appropriations for three years, but refused to make it a part of the governmental body. As a matter of fact, the Tariff Board was a good deal like Topsy in *Uncle Tom's Cabin,* for like her it was " never born, but just grew." When the Payne-Aldrich Tariff was passed, it contained a provision permitting the President " to employ such persons as may be required " to assist him and the officers of the Government in Customs matters. President Taft took advantage of that clause in the law to construct a Tariff Board. This Board took up an entirely new problem in the United States, that of direct and personal investigation of industrial conditions and production costs. It was pioneer work, and was surrounded with all of the difficulties attendant upon such an undertaking. What the Board tried to do was directed along three different lines:

First: To secure, as to articles in the tariff, concise information regarding the nature of the article, the chief sources of supply at home and abroad, the methods of its production, its chief uses, statistics of production, imports and exports, with an estimate of the *ad valorem* equivalent for all specific duties. This was an endeavor to follow out what President Taft meant by " translating the tariff into English."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Second: To make an inquiry into actual costs of production both at home and abroad, especially comparative costs upon the same or similar articles. This was carried on with a full realization of the fact that there are many manufactured articles of such exceptional quality that no comparison can be made between the products of different mills; but realizing also, on the other hand, that there are many standardized articles in the case of which definite results can be secured. The work along this line was planned to deal entirely with actual costs and not with hypothetical, or average, costs.

Third: To secure accurate information regarding actual prices at home and abroad, the peculiar local conditions affecting any particular industry, and the general conditions of home and foreign competition to which it is subject. This embraced both the technical and commercial sides of the question.

What the results of the Tariff Board's efforts were, and whether or not it justified itself and its existence, is a question that is not necessary to consider at this time; and the testimony of a member of it, who might naturally be prejudiced in its behalf, is not the proper source from which to gain such information. One clear result, however, was the insight that the work of the Tariff Board gave into the possibilities inhering in a Tariff Commission,—and, what is equally important, the impossibilities as well.

To the important and leading question: Is there a proper field for a Tariff Commission? my answer, as the result of three years' experience in Tariff Board work, is decidedly that there is, but that such a Commission should be founded upon a proper basis, and its work confined within its natural and proper boundaries. There is a field for a Tariff Commission, not for the purpose of determining what kind of a tariff shall be put upon the statute books of the country, but, after the country has determined what it wants, or what it thinks it wants, to give genuine and expert aid to the men whose duty it is to draw up a law in conformity to the verdict of the voters. By the use of a Commission, real inquiry at first hand into tariff problems and industrial conditions can be obtained.

The present system of framing a law as the result of a series of hearings, with the clashing of opposing forces before a committee, has elements of weakness that have long

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been realized. In that particular, it is merely a question as to whether or not, under our old methods, proper provision is made by the Government for an adequate inquiry into the nature of tariff legislation and the industrial effect of each schedule. There are a great many people in the country who think that the present system of hearings is sufficient, and there is no need for either change or the creation of any new agency; but there is also a vigorous idea that some body should be brought into existence, or some agency created, which should conduct a continuous inquiry of an impartial and non-partisan character regarding tariff matters which are of vital importance to the industrial life of America.

A properly constituted Tariff Commission, with its work sanely planned and carried out, can be of great value to all branches of the Government, to Congress, and to the President. There is hardly a sphere of Governmental activity at Washington that does not need to have some source of information to which to turn on customs and tariff matters. The Executive Departments of the Government need it for proper guidance in the making of regulations and the interpretation of tariff law. Congress needs it for facts and figures dealing with industrial conditions and the tariff situation in the world in the making of new tariff laws or changes in the old. The President needs it, because it is his duty both to approve all tariff acts before they become law, and to recommend to Congress, should he so desire, changes in the existing law.

One result of a Tariff Commission would be the ability to have in the United States a tariff law in which the duties should be specific. This would aid greatly the proper administration of the tariff and the knowledge of both the American producer and the foreign importer as to what the law really means, and what it spells in dollars and cents as to the duties which it levies. That a tariff made up of specific duties is the proper one for any large commercial country, there should be no question. The system of *ad valorem* duties is based on a wrong principle, and its proper administration is almost impossible. From a protectionist standpoint it is a very faulty thing. When the amount of duty depends upon the market or selling price, it creates a condition of affairs in which, when prices are high and the American manufacturer needs less duty for protective purposes,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he receives the most protection; when prices are low and he needs as much duty as possible to prevent his being undersold, then he receives the least protection.

From an administrative standpoint, with *ad valorem* duties there is always the matter of under-valuation. At best this can only be reduced to a minimum, and to do even that requires the expenditure by the Government of a vast sum of money each year for purposes of inquiry and investigation. Other great commercial nations of the world have long ago reached the conclusion that the best customs duty from a national standpoint is the specific duty. The great barrier in the way of having such a system put into effect in the United States is the way in which our tariffs are now made. They are constructed in a rush and hurry by committees of Congress which have neither time nor opportunity nor expert knowledge sufficient to construct a tariff law based upon the scientific principles that specific duties make necessary. Therefore, it is the natural and the inevitable result that *ad valorem* duties are used because of the ease with which they can be assessed by the tariff makers. A Tariff Commission, with its knowledge and its force of experts, could be utilized by turning into specific duties, so far as possible, the wishes of Congressional committees regarding the different articles under a tariff law, and in this one particular could justify its existence.

With the question of a Tariff Commission arises the question of costs of production, and whether or not it is possible to obtain such. The experience of the Tariff Board was that, if proper co-operation is given by the American manufacturer, costs of production can be secured, so far as this country is concerned, and it was also its experience that a great many foreign costs can be obtained through similar co-operation by manufacturers across the water. The Board did not delude itself, however, into the belief that a mere statistical knowledge of comparative costs of production is an all-sufficient basis for a tariff judgment. To all figures of production costs there must be applied common sense and practical business judgment. Conditions of competition in the different industries must also be considered, and the fact that the question of prices is oftentimes more fundamental than the question of costs.

Remembering, however, that tariff rates are in any case merely rough approximations, there can be gathered a fund

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of information in regard to the production and cost of articles here and abroad that would be of immense value to any body of men entrusted with the framing of a tariff law. There are innumerable articles, of course, concerning which cost of production, even if it could be known, would be of little value in drawing up a system of tariff duties. But there are many articles, standard both in quality and in world-wide use, in regard to which production-cost figures could be obtained that would go far towards showing the practical difference between manufacture here and abroad, and the conditions surrounding it.

Another line of work which a Tariff Commission could profitably follow would be to root out the inconsistencies and the little annoyances that creep into any American tariff law. It is impossible for any committee to be watchful and careful on all points; and during the making of a law so complicated, and covering so many branches of human activity as a tariff law, there are many things which creep in unobserved, and whose presence is not discovered until the law is in active operation. The result generally is a multitude of contradictions and inconsistencies. These are matters that are usually of little importance, except to the individual concerned. They are merely things that pester the individual and disgust him with the whole system of tariffs because of the one case in which the tariff shoe pinches him unjustly.

There are certain essentials that must be kept in mind in any Tariff Commission law, and in any organization of such a body. One of these is permanency. Its tenure of office must be such as to leave it untouched by any change of national administration. Unless this is the case, such a body will be weakened and handicapped both in its powers and in its work by uncertainty as to the perpetuation of such powers in the future. It must have a tenure strong enough to outlast the administration of a President not in sympathy with its efforts. One of the great values of a Tariff Commission would lie not in any report on any particular tariff act, nor any result of a particular inquiry or investigation, but in the permanent continuance of an unbiased study of industrial conditions from year to year. One great element to be avoided in the work of such a Commission is haste and hurry, and the leaving of ragged ends which lack of time does not permit to be incorporated into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the work in hand. No matter how formidable in result a report might be in connection with an investigation as regards a present or a proposed tariff, it would, after a short time, have an interest merely academic or historical, owing to changing conditions of industrial affairs. Such investigations would really serve their best purpose as the foundation for a continuous study of industrial changes year in and year out. It is, therefore, essential that for the success of any commission the tenure of office must be such as to make the members independent of the goodwill of any individual, and free from the influence or control of any political party.

Another essential element is the proper formation of the commission, and the practical appreciation of the fact that it is a business proposition and not one of theory. It should be realized that the tariff question is one of business and not of mathematics and, if a tariff commission is to be successful, and is to do work of genuine benefit, it must be kept out of the control of the theorist and the statistician. Both of these qualities are important enough in their own way, but they do not fit in with a work that deals with the business problems of the country. There are too many ways of using figures known to experts to make it safe to place entire guidance in the conclusions of a statistician, and both he and the mere theorist are too warped in mind, and not sufficiently susceptible to argument, to make them safe advisers in matters which vitally concern the business of a whole nation.

It is essential, too, that the Tariff Commission have the sympathy and goodwill of the manufacturing interests of the country. Without genuine aid on their part, a Tariff Commission will fall far short of doing its proper work. Any Tariff Commission should proceed on the principle that co-operation is better than compulsion. Without the co-operation of the manufacturers, no tariff body can obtain the real facts or make findings of real value. This was made plain in the work of the Tariff Board, and to this fact every member of the Board can bear witness. It was the willing assistance given to that body by the manufacturers of the country that enabled it to secure information necessary to its work. It is only by utilizing the knowledge and the experience of the manufacturer, the comprehensive knowledge that comes from years of training in industrial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

life, that any body can secure the right perspective and the facts indispensable to the making of fair reports.

It was the experience of the Tariff Board that its most valuable help came from American manufacturers who of their own accord gave of their time and their trained knowledge to help the Board in its work. Information that comes from compulsion, and unwillingly, falls far short of accomplishing results. It is lacking in essential details that can be supplied only through the willingness of the manufacturer to co-operate with the investigating body. Testimony given under compulsion, though it may be accurate so far as it goes, is unwilling and half-hearted, and therefore incomplete. The whole truth can be much better ascertained by co-operation with fair-minded and public-spirited business men than by the exercise of legal powers of a compulsory nature. It must also be remembered that much of the information received must be held as confidential by any Tariff Commission, so far as details of private business are concerned, and that the most valuable kind of confidential information can be secured by personal and informal conferences which could not be obtained by the examination of witnesses under oath, or by any drastic power of inquisition given by law.

But a Tariff Commission has its pitfalls as well as its merits. It is always dangerous to have a commission of inquiry in existence to take up grievances. The fact that there is such a body to appeal to encourages complaint on the part of men who otherwise might be satisfied with conditions. The creation of any tribunal for the receipt of grievances and the investigation of their merits, tends to keep matters in a constant stir. In the case of a Tariff Commission, it would keep the producers of the country in continual apprehension of changes and the necessity of readjusting themselves to new conditions. As things go on today, the manufacturer knows in a general way how long an existing tariff will endure, and can govern himself accordingly. It is, of course, axiomatic that business can adjust itself to anything but uncertainty. Consequently, to many business people the creation of a Tariff Commission would mean that above their heads would always hang an industrial Sword of Damocles to keep them and their affairs in uncertainty.

There is also danger that a Tariff Commission might

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

get into its head the idea that it must constantly make recommendations for a change in order to justify its existence. Even if nothing serious were wrong there might still be the ambition to demonstrate industry and improvement by inquiries and investigations that might better be left alone.

There would be grave danger in the situation unless the duties and powers of the Tariff Commission were strictly defined by law. It is not enough to say that a commission shall be "non-partisan." What "non-partisan" means in relation to the tariff is something that I do not know. Everyone who has either studied the tariff question, or who has had experience in business, is "partisan" toward some one kind of tariff. The man who has no ideas of any kind as regards the tariff might be a non-partisan, and from that angle be fitted for a place on a commission, but he would be of no value to such a work. Therefore it must be assumed that the members of the Tariff Commission will be partisan, but sanely so. This means that their recommendations must be confined to the presentation of facts, and not extended to the giving of advice upon tariff matters in general.

There was proof of this in the work of the Tariff Board. In connection with the woolen schedule investigation, we conducted a very thorough inquiry into the cost of producing raw wool, not only in the United States but in all of the wool-producing countries. The results of that investigation were something that the Board, made up of members of both political parties, and of different tariff beliefs, could unite in presenting. We proved to the satisfaction of each member of the Board that the average wool grown in this country costs over nine cents a pound more to raise than does the wool of Australia, and that it costs twice as much to raise as the wool of South America. Upon such a statement of fact all the members of the Board could and did agree. If it had been necessary, however, to report to Congress what recommendation the Board should make as to tariff duties on wool, there would have been a complete division in the Board, and two conflicting reports.

There would have been a report from some members stating that wool was so important an article to the country's growth and existence that it was necessary so to protect the wool-grower that he could at all times turn with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

profit his attention to the raising of sheep, and that he should have sufficient protection from wool raised in other countries, no matter how great that protection must be. On the other hand, other members of the Board would have reported that the difference in the cost of the production of wool here and abroad was so great that, in order to give complete tariff protection, so high a duty was necessary as to involve a bad economic policy; that there was a limit beyond which duties should not go, no matter what the apparent necessity of an American industry; that any industry that required for its protection a duty beyond a certain point was an industry not fitted to the country, and too artificial a one to be part of the country's necessities; therefore, as wool could not be protected without an enormous duty, it would be well to put it on the free list. Agreeing, as we all did, on the facts in the case, those would have been the divergent opinions we would have expressed if called upon to report to Congress our recommendations in regard to the proper duty on wool.

Such would be the case in any Tariff Commission when faced with a similar problem. Any fair-minded commission can be a non-partisan commission, so far as facts are concerned; but when asked for recommendations as to what tariff policy should be pursued, the members will naturally and inevitably divide, and the line of cleavage will follow the tariff ideas of which the members are respectively the partisans.

One important question to answer in all of the discussion regarding the formation of a Tariff Commission is this: Is the creation of such a body worth while? The reason for doubt on this point does not imply that the Commission cannot secure real results, or that its investigations and reports will not be of value. Further, there is still the question whether, when these results are obtained, and these reports made, they will be acted upon, and whether they will be put to practical use by the lawmakers of the nation. Those who entertain such doubts point to the lack of result that followed the work of the Tariff Board so far as legislation was concerned.

There is, of course, no question as to the fact that, so far as immediate legislation was concerned, the work of the Tariff Board was a mere prologue without a play. The fruits of its investigations were spurned by the men who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were framing tariff bills in Congress, and deliberately so. This, however, was the result rather of political policy than of anything else. The majority party in the House of Representatives had taken the position that it cared nothing for the differences in costs of production here and abroad, and for such other inquiries as the Tariff Board was making, since a tariff law was to be framed upon other lines entirely, and that, furthermore, they took no stock in the Tariff Board idea.

Before any such legislation was definitely planned or projected, President Taft invited Mr. Underwood and the members of the Tariff Board to an evening conference at the White House. At this meeting the President formally tendered the services of the Tariff Board to Mr. Underwood, as Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for any tariff inquiry or assistance that the Committee desired. At this time the Board was at least bi-partisan, if not non-partisan, and made up of representatives of both political parties. There was a marked lack of enthusiasm on the part of Mr. Underwood, as he acknowledged this offer from the President, and he carefully refrained from making any promises as to the proffered services. As a matter of fact, there was no attempt at concealment on his part as to what his views were regarding a Tariff Board, and regarding the intention of the Ways and Means Committee to do their work unassisted and unhindered by any tariff body. So, instead of being on a basis of co-operation, the Ways and Means Committee and the Tariff Board revolved in different orbits, and, instead of paying heed to the Board's reports, the Ways and Means Committee used much of its energy in an endeavor to discredit them. If that is to be the case with the work of a Tariff Commission, and if the result of its inquiries are to be set aside as of no practical value for legislation, then there is serious doubt as to whether the establishment of such a body is worth the effort and the expenditure.

The fact that the Tariff Commission idea is very popular in the country does not necessarily mean that, after it is established, there would be equal approval of it and of its work. It is natural that before legislation is passed, everyone supposes that the project which he favors will be framed into law in accordance with his own views. Thomas B. Reed spoke truth when he said that " an un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

written tariff fits every district." Thus, an unwritten Tariff Commission law fits the approval of everyone desiring such legislation.

Much of the failure or success of a Tariff Commission would depend upon its membership, and fully as much upon its conduct of its own duties. There are two elements in American life that it must satisfy as to its efficiency and fairmindedness. These are the American producers, and the members of Congress. Unless it appeals to the producer, so that he will be willing to co-operate in the gathering of information and to aid by putting at the disposal of the Commission the knowledge gained by his own experience in different types of American industry, it will be impossible for the Commission to make its inquiries effective, and so it will fail to achieve success. Even if it has such co-operation, and with the helping hand of American industry succeeds in getting real facts into its reports, these reports will be of only academic value unless Congress believes in them and enacts them into law. If these two factors of the problem can be worked out satisfactorily, there is a real field for a Tariff Commission, and such a body can secure both in this country and abroad such information, both in quality and in quantity, as will make a Tariff Commission a permanent Government factor and a potent tariff-making force.

JAMES B. REYNOLDS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LAND PROBLEM IN MEXICO

BY LEBBEUS R. WILFLEY

THE general impression which prevails in the United States that an agrarian question lies at the basis of the present revolution in Mexico, is not supported by the facts, as an investigation of the situation will show. In the first place, there is no general agrarian question in Mexico. Oppression in Mexico is general and there are abuses which are universal; but this is not true, with one exception which will be mentioned later, of those abuses arising out of the administration of landed estates. The land question is local, and differs in different localities. It is serious in only one state—Morelos.

There can be no general land question in Mexico, for two reasons: First, because the Indian does not want land, and second, if he did want it, it exists in great abundance for all. Only about fifteen million people, the majority of whom are Indians, live in Mexico, which is a country of over 800,000 square miles, or 500,000,000 acres. The fact that the Indians do not want land has been demonstrated many times and in various ways. It was demonstrated conclusively on a national scale by Benito Juarez, the great author of the Reform Laws of 1857-59 and the hero of the Mexican people. This was done in the following manner: Under the Spanish régime the Indians dwelt in villages (as they do now) and were given the free enjoyment and use in common of all lands adjacent to the villages. The village proper was a rectangular plot of ground twelve hundred yards square, with a church in the center. This was called the *Fundo Legal.* Surrounding this was a body of ground called *Egidos,* where the villagers raised their crops. Beyond this were the Communal Lands, which corresponded to the town common of English and New England towns. Here the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Indians grazed and watered their cattle and gathered their wood and charcoal.

When the liberal party triumphed under the leadership of Benito Jaurez, the Government not only nationalized all the property of the Church dedicated to the use of public worship, education, etc., but it confiscated many valuable *haciendas* in various parts of the Republic owned by the Clergy. These *haciendas* were sold to the friends of the liberal party. At the same time, this Reform Law of 1859 provided that the public lands surrounding the villages should be divided among the Indians and that the head of each family should receive title to his quota in his own name. This was done. The theory was that the Indian should no longer be treated as a child and a ward of the nation, but as a responsible citizen. On the same theory and at the same time, the Mexican Constitution, which is modeled after the United States Constitution, was given to the Mexican people. The net result of this law of reform was that the Indian lost his lands.

In happened in this way: The neighboring *haciendado* immediately began acquiring title to the small Indian farms around the villages. In those states where the rich lands were scarce, as was the case in Morelos, this process was carried on until the big land owners had acquired all the lands up to the edge of the towns, leaving the Indians with only their shacks in the villages. This was easily done. The new purchasers of the confiscated *haciendas* were mainly Spaniards. The Spaniard always wielded a powerful influence with the officials of both the Government and of the church.

Those things which cause people to become attached to the soil in Northern countries do not exist in Mexico. The soil is rich, the climate is salubrious, and the wants of the peon are few, hence the value of the private ownership of land does not appeal to him. He was therefore easily induced to part with his lands, and under all the circumstances it would have been miraculous if he had received fair compensation for his holdings. The operation of the above mentioned law is better illustrated in Morelos than in any other state, for the reason that there the soil is rich and scarce, and well adapted to the cultivation of sugar. In the states where land is plentiful and poor the Indians still hold their lands.

Since this nation-wide experiment of Benito Juarez, a number of experiments have been made by governors of dif-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ferent states, and always with the same results. On two occasions, for example, the governors of the State of Zacatecas divided large tracts of lands among the peons. They held them for a few years only. In too many cases the land was mortgaged and sold to get money with which to dissipate.

No, the Indian does not want land. What he wants is permanent employment at a reasonable wage. He wants to live in comfort without the anxiety and labor which are incident to the successful management of landed estates. This trait of the Indian character is well illustrated by the fact that a great majority of the race prefer to dwell on the table-lands which occupy the central part of the Republic, where the climate is cool, the land poor and dear, and water scarce, rather than to live in the low lands along the coast, where the climate is hot, the soil rich and cheap, and water plentiful. The trait of the Indian character which causes him to do this is the key to the proper understanding of the land problem in Mexico.

In fact, there can be no full comprehension of the so-called "land problem" without an understanding of the character of the Mexican peon. The great problem in Mexico is not the *land* question, but the *Indian* question.

The general impression which exists in the United States, that Mexico is a Latin country, is a mistake. President Diaz estimated that in ninety per cent of the Mexican population Indian blood predominated, and that considerably over fifty per cent of the population was of pure Indian blood. In this fact we have the A B C of a correct understanding of the Mexican situation; and the X Y Z of it lies in the knowledge of the fact that the Mexican Indian is similar to the North American Indian with whom we are familiar, except in two respects. The North American Indian was a nomad, and a warrior; while the Mexican Indian is attached to his village, and is a pacific individual. Otherwise they have the same characteristics: they are treacherous, revengeful, cruel, lazy, opposed to modern civilization, lacking in initiative, in the power of forecast, in self-restraint, and are devoid of interest in the general welfare of the community. (Of course there are exceptions to the rule. There are some exceedingly clever Indians, and, with opportunity, this class would undoubtedly come to the front.) The real problem in Mexico is the problem of the races. With ten per cent of the popula-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion Caucasian and ninety per cent Indian, how is it possible for a constitution and a body of laws to be evolved and adopted by the two races which would be applicable to both? The proposition is an absurdity. The preponderance of Indian blood in the population of the country constitutes the great fundamental problem which embraces and overshadows all others in Mexico. It is the basis of all revolutions, for the reason that revolutions such as usually occur in Mexico could not take place except in a community where the masses of the people are in ignorance. It makes real democracy in Mexico impossible, and it gives rise to all of those problems which are now vexing that unfortunate country, and the solution of which is fraught with so much difficulty.

The fact is that the real land problem in Mexico is *not more land for the people, but more people for the land.* It is well known that in many of the states the people are actually "land poor."

Much has been said and written about a few great estates in Mexico, like the Terrazas estate in Chihuahua, which are pointed out as types illustrative of the general situation. This is misleading. There are several large estates in the country, parts of which have been acquired by unfair and illegitimate methods, but they are the exception and not the rule, and are not sufficiently numerous to give rise to a general agrarian problem.

Two further facts which have important bearing on the Mexican land question should not be overlooked. In the first place, most of these large tracts of land are without water, and must be irrigated to be made productive. In the second place, by the nature of the case, the cultivation of sugar must be done on a large scale to make it profitable. This is so all over the world. These two facts render the operation and ownership of small tracts of land difficult and unprofitable by individual owners.

It will thus be seen that the land problem in Mexico exists in a few localities only, and that abuses arising in connection with it are in no sense general. Strictly speaking, it exists only in one locality: in the State of Morelos.

LEBBEUS R. WILFLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MISREPRESENTATION IN RAILROAD AFFAIRS

BY GEORGE KENNAN

No public question or private transaction can ever be profitably discussed unless the essential facts involved therein are accurately set forth. In an article entitled "The Chicago & Alton Case," published in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for January, 1916, I criticized as inaccurate and misleading certain statements concerning this case made by Professor William Z. Ripley in a recently published book entitled, *Railroads: Finance and Organization.*

These erroneous and misleading statements were: 1. that the Chicago & Alton Railroad, when the Harriman syndicate bought it, was doing "a constantly expanding business"; 2. that the syndicate made a profit of $23,600,000 out of its financiering; 3. that the operations of the syndicate were "concealed," "covered up," "never disclosed," and "obscured in the published accounts"; 4. that the reorganization of the road created "the need of high rates for service in order to support the fraudulent capitalization"; 5. that as a result of the recapitalization the road was "physically crippled"; and 6. that Mr. Harriman was a "conspirator," whose management of the property was "unscrupulous," "fraudulent," "piratical" and "predatory." (pp. 77, 262-266.)

In my article on the Chicago & Alton case, I furnished what seemed to me to be proof that each and every one of these statements was erroneous. Does Professor Ripley, in his reply (published in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for April, 1916) question my proofs, or attempt to make good his original assertions? Not in any way whatever. He brings up sundry new matters, and proves conclusively that the capitalization of the Alton was largely increased—a fact that has never been disputed—but he does not join issue with me on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any of the points that I raised. So far, therefore, as silence can give consent, he tacitly admits that his statements with regard to these particular matters were so erroneous that he does not care to defend them. Having cleared the ground to this extent, I now purpose to consider his latest statement of the Chicago & Alton case, which is contained in his REVIEW article.

The unproved and unprovable assertions on the first page, with regard to Mr. Harriman's influence and power, do not seem to call for serious criticism. Everybody knows that Mr. Harriman was a prominent figure in the great fields of transportation and finance; but few believe, or can be made to believe, that he controlled "the greatest banking institutions" in the country; that he did what he liked with "the vast resources of the New York life insurance companies"; that "laws were enacted at his will"; and that "State and national conventions" assembled only to "take his orders." Able and influential Mr. Harriman undoubtedly was; but he never exercised the almost supreme control over railroads, banks, insurance companies, legislatures and political conventions that is here attributed to him. When, therefore, Theodore Roosevelt intervened, as Mr. Ripley says he did, and "thwarted his" (Mr. Harriman's) "purpose to become an absolute dictator in transportation affairs," the President would seem to have acted without sufficient knowledge, or upon inadequate provocation.

But would it not have been well for Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Ripley to agree in advance upon their joint defense? Mr. Roosevelt says it is "monstrously iniquitous" to suppose that his "personal disagreement with a railroad president" had anything to do with the prosecution of Mr. Harriman by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Then comes Professor Ripley with the declaration that it was "Theodore Roosevelt" who "blocked the path" of the ambitious railroad president and "thwarted his purpose." Who, then, really did do it? According to Mr. Ripley it was Theodore Roosevelt; but the latter seems to disclaim responsibility. This conflict of testimony leaves the question in doubt, and possibly we may never know who it really was that brought about the investigation of Mr. Harriman's past activities, and thus saved the country from an "absolute dictatorship in transportation affairs."

Professor Ripley's re-statement of the Chicago & Alton

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

case from his 1907 point of view does not seem to need comment. Neither does the page of statistical proof that the capitalization of the Alton was expanded. All this ground we have covered before. The only new matters brought up are: 1. the responsibility for the present financial condition of the Alton Company; 2. the mortgaging of 34 miles of unbuilt road; 3. the alleged attempt to " cover up " the discount on the 3 per cent bonds by means of " deceptive bookkeeping "; and 4. the alleged " concealment," in general, of the syndicate's operations.

1. The responsibility for the present financial condition of the Alton Company.

Professor Ripley says that the Alton was " financially assassinated " by the Harriman syndicate in 1899. (p. 541). When Mr. Harriman and President Felton severed their connection with the Alton, after the transfer of control to the Toledo, St. Louis & Western in 1907, the road was paying the stipulated dividend of 4 per cent on its preferred stock, and earning 5 per cent on its common. It was, therefore, not only a solvent but a prosperous concern. What happened afterward? Between 1907 and 1912, under the Shonts management, the gross earnings increased 13.5 per cent, while the net earnings fell off 27.8 per cent. In 1912 the road was doing $1,726,296 more business than in 1907, while, at the same time, it was earning $1,227,109 less money, owing largely to the fact that it had increased its operating expenses from 65.5 to 78 per cent. If the year 1907 (the last year of the Harriman-Felton management) be compared with the year 1915 (the latest year for which a report has been made) the result is equally instructive. In this period of eight years, the volume of business increased more than 11 per cent (11.21); the operating expenses rose from 65.5 per cent to 81.3 per cent, while the net earnings fell off nearly 40 per cent (39.67). This, in itself, is quite enough to account for the Alton's present financial condition, and for this the Harriman syndicate cannot possibly be held responsible. Mr. Harriman left the road on a dividend-paying basis in 1907, and two years later he died.

2. The mortgaging of 34 miles of unbuilt road.

At the time when the Chicago & Alton Railway Company was organized, it was thought expedient to secure the right to build, in the future, a short cut, or air line, between Springfield Junction and Murrayville, which would shorten

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by about five miles the distance between Kansas City and Chicago. When it was proposed to put a mortgage on a part of the road, to secure a part of the bond issue, the question came up: should such mortgage be made to cover this legally authorized but as yet unbuilt cut-off? Counsel for the company and counsel for the trustees both advised that the short branch line be included. Upon this advice Mr. Harriman and his associates acted; but in order to proceed openly and above board, they distinctly said, in their listing application to the New York Stock Exchange:

> This line has been surveyed, but has not yet been constructed. By advice of counsel it was included in the description, so as to fasten the lien of the mortgage thereon as soon as constructed.

By quoting selected parts of the testimony of the Rock Island Company's controller, Mr. Charles W. Hillard, Professor Ripley tries to make it appear that in this mortgaging of an unbuilt branch line there was something crooked, if not illegal. As a matter of fact, however, the mortgaging of a short stretch of unbuilt line was not only a legal but a very common practise. At a later stage in the hearing, Controller Hillard himself said:

> I would like to make a little explanation. I fear the language I used in answering the question propounded yesterday was not as it should have been. It has been taken as a criticism of making a mortgage on a road before it was constructed. That I know to be a very common thing. . . . I know it to have been true for many years. I have done it myself. (Official testimony, pp. 21-22).

If Professor Ripley had wished to be even reasonably fair, he would have quoted this part of Controller Hillard's testimony, as well as the parts that he selected—but then, of course, he could not have made the misleading impression that he was apparently trying to make.

3. The alleged attempt to " cover up " the discount on the bonds.

By again quoting a selected part of the testimony of Controller Hillard—a part drawn from him by the improper leading questions of the Commission's counsel—Professor Ripley tries to make it appear that an ordinary and customary treatment of items in double-entry bookkeeping was an attempt to conceal the sale of the 3 per cent bonds to the stockholders at a discount of 35 per cent. The matter in question was the propriety of charging the discount against

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the surplus of $12,444,000, obtained by capitalizing sums spent for past betterments. The Rock Island controller—a more or less critical but apparently a fair and candid witness—tried to explain to the Commission that this treatment of the items was only "a matter of" bookkeeping "judgment." "Having done what they did do," he said (that is, having capitalized past betterments), "they had a perfect right to credit this $12,444,000 to profit and loss; and then the discount on bonds was a proper charge against profit and loss." (p. 11 of Hillard's testimony). The witness disapproved the capitalization of sums spent for past betterments, but he saw nothing wrong in the bookkeeping. By skillful elimination and substitution, however, Professor Ripley makes Mr. Hillard seem to condemn the method of keeping accounts. In the testimony relating to the bookkeeping, Professor Ripley quotes Commissioner Lane as asking the following question, and Mr. Hillard as making the following reply:

Commissioner Lane: If those things could be done . . . would not a practise of that kind destroy the integrity and uniformity of railroad accounts generally?

Mr. Hillard: It would upset the whole system.

The reader naturally supposes that the question of the Commissioner and the reply of the witness related to the method of bookkeeping, that is, to the setting off of the bond discount against the $12,444,000 surplus for the alleged purpose of concealment. In fact, however, they related to a wholly different matter. In Professor Ripley's quotation they are made a part of Mr. Hillard's testimony on a question of bookkeeping. In the official record they appear as a part of his testimony on the question whether a later board of directors can properly reverse the action of an earlier board. Professor Ripley puts two scraps of testimony together as if they belonged together, but in the official record they are four pages apart and relate to wholly different matters. Mr. Hillard did not say that the Alton's bookkeeping methods would "upset the whole system" of railroad accounting. He said that if one board of directors should pay for betterments out of revenue, and a later board should reverse that action and charge those same betterments to capital, such a practise would "upset the whole system." (Mr. Hillard's testimony, pp. 12 and 16).

It is proper enough, in quoting the testimony of a witness,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to omit such parts of it as may not bear on the matter in hand; but it is not proper, by eliminating four pages—1600 words—to make a witness seem to say what he did not say. Commissioner Lane's question and Mr. Hillard's answer are made by Professor Ripley to discredit the bookkeeping; while, in reality, both related to an entirely different subject which had been taken up after the question of bookkeeping had been dropped. In order to make the quotation fit the place to which he transferred it, Professor Ripley found it necessary to omit Commissioner Lane's words: "and revoked from time to time as the directorate changes." This clause, if allowed to stand, would show what the true context was, so Mr. Ripley suppressed it. Such garbling of official testimony is not permissible.

Mr. Ripley, however, resorts to elimination and substitution not only when he quotes the testimony of Mr. Hillard, but also when he quotes the testimony of Mr. Harriman. In the latter case he eliminates fourteen pages; and if, after reading in the official record the first part of his quotation, you wish to find the last part, you must skip from page 117 to page 131. Five asterisks are hardly enough to indicate the omission of five or six thousand words. The matter under investigation was the failure of the Alton Company to pay dividends on its common stock. Mr. Kellogg (the Commission's counsel) asked Mr. Harriman: "Don't you think that when stock of a railroad company is put out, there is some obligation, at some time, to pay something on it?" Professor Ripley quotes Mr. Harriman as replying merely: "Yes, sir." Then the professor puts in five asterisks and coolly jumps fourteen pages to another question. What Mr. Harriman really said was: "Yes, sir—wait a minute!"—showing that he wished to make an explanation. Mr. Kellogg, however, would not listen, and was already asking another question when Mr. Harriman again said: "Wait a minute!" The witness finally got a chance to explain; but his "Wait a minute!" and his explanation are in the fourteen pages that Mr. Ripley omits. (Mr. Harriman's testimony, pp. 117 and 131). Such manipulation of documentary material is not creditable to a professor of economics. It might be the last resort, perhaps, of an unscrupulous attorney who felt conscious that he had a desperately weak case; but it is not fair controversy, nor is it fair to Mr. Harriman.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The whole question of alleged "concealment" by means of "deceptive bookkeeping" seems to me to be conclusively settled by the wide publicity given in the press to the discount on the bonds, which, according to Professor Ripley, it was the purpose of the syndicate to conceal. No sane and reasonable man juggles with his books in order to conceal a certain fact, while, at the same time, he publishes that fact broadcast in the newspapers. The sale of the 3 per cent bonds to the stockholders at a discount of 35 per cent was made known to the public through all the leading financial journals of New York. References to it may be found in various letters and circulars issued and widely distributed by the Alton Company in the summer of 1899; in the *Manual of Statistics* for 1900, p. 81; in *Moody's Manual* for 1901, p. 1198; in the listing application to the New York Stock Exchange, Nov. 17, 1900; in the *Commercial & Financial Chronicle* for July 22, 1899, and April 14, 1900; and in every number of the Investor's Supplement of the *Chronicle* from 1900 to 1905. Nothing but a fixed determination to blacken Mr. Harriman's reputation could have led counsel for the Government to charge the Alton syndicate with a resort to "deceptive bookkeeping" as a means of covering up this discount.

4. The alleged "concealment," in general, of the Alton syndicate operations.

This charge may best be refuted, perhaps, by means of quotations from the *Commercial & Financial Chronicle* of New York. In the course of the Alton investigation, counsel for the syndicate and counsel for the Commission both agreed that a file of this well-known journal should be put in evidence, and either side should be at liberty to refer to it as an authority on financial transactions. (Mr. Harriman's testimony, p. 386).

The *Chronicle's* references to the Chicago & Alton reorganization began as early as February 4, 1899, when it made public the fact that the road had been purchased by the syndicate, and that "the deal would be financed by Kuhn, Loeb & Co." As the earlier steps in the reorganization have never been questioned and are not now in dispute, I pass over references made to them in the numbers of the *Chronicle* for February 11, February 25, March 4, March 18, April 1, April 8, May 20, June 24, July 1, and July 15, 1899, and begin with the number for July 22, 1899, when the syndicate issued a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

circular offering the 3 per cent bonds to the stockholders at a discount of 35 per cent. This is one of the matters that Professor Ripley says was "covered up," and that he thinks the Interstate Commerce Commission uncovered in 1907. The *Chronicle* published it in July, 1899, and explained what the syndicate proposed to do with the proceeds of these bonds.

One week later—July 29, 1899—the *Chronicle* announced that Goldman, Sachs & Co. had arranged to purchase from the syndicate $10,000,000 of these securities. This is another "concealed" matter that the Interstate Commerce Commission triumphantly brought to light seven years after the *Chronicle* had made it public.

On the 7th of April, 1900, the *Chronicle* announced the incorporation of the Chicago & Alton Rail*way* Company, and said that it would lease the Chicago & Alton Rail*road* Company for a period of ninety-nine years. "A new corporation was necessary," the *Chronicle* explained, "because the charter of the old company would not permit the merger of the new acquisitions," (the Quincy, Carrollton & St. Louis Railroad and the Peoria Northern Railroad). Professor Ripley, however, gives a different explanation, based on the theory of more "covering up." He asserts that the purpose of the syndicate in creating a new corporation was to "obscure the income account" of the old company, and that it was merely a shrewd "device." But he furnishes no evidence in support of his assertion, nor does he show that the "income account" of the old company ever was "obscured."

On the 14th of April, 1900, the *Chronicle* printed the annual report of the Alton Company for the year ended December 31, 1899. This report showed that the company had capitalized the sum of $12,444,000 which had been spent for permanent betterments and had previously been charged to revenue.

May 5, 1900, the *Chronicle* noted the fact that another mortgage had been executed to secure $22,000,000 of 3½ bonds, and one week later—May 12, 1900—it explained that this mortgage was a lien on the stock of the old company, as well as on the track and equipment of the Peoria Northern.

On the 12th of May, 1900, the *Chronicle* announced the declaration of a 30 per cent "extra" cash dividend on the stock of the old company, and said that this dividend represented "the accumulated surplus earnings of the company which had not been distributed to the stock."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

May 19, 1900, the *Chronicle* clearly stated the fact that the 30 per cent dividend covered a part of the surplus of $12,444,000 obtained by capitalizing sums spent for permanent betterments in previous years. It also explained the relations between the Alton Railway Company and the Alton Railroad Company, and set forth the terms on which the latter had been leased to the former. Finally, it gave the amounts of the new securities that had been distributed proportionately among the members of the syndicate, and a little later stated that the market value of the cash and new securities so distributed was $1,115.75 for every $1,000 subscribed.

November 17, 1900, the *Chronicle* published in full the listing application to the New York Stock Exchange, in which every feature of the reorganization that could possibly interest or concern an investor was fully and clearly described.

First and last, in the two years 1899 and 1900, the *Chronicle* published no fewer than thirty-six editorials, statements, circulars, reports, notices, or news items, relating to the Chicago & Alton reorganization; and if there was any fact "uncovered" by the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1907 that had not been uncovered by the *Chronicle* six years earlier, I have been unable to find it.

Professor Ripley says, in his latest article, that "everything hinges" on the question "whether frank and full publicity prevailed," and whether those who bought the Alton securities from the syndicate "purchased them under a misapprehension as to their value." (p. 543). The evidence above set forth, which is taken wholly from a journal recognized by the Commission itself as an authority, seems to show conclusively that every feature of the Alton reorganization was laid frankly and fully before the public, and that no investor who bought Alton stocks or bonds could possibly have "purchased them under a misapprehension as to their value."

Who, then, was hurt by the operations of Mr. Harriman and his associates? Not the old stockholders, because, as even Mr. Ripley admits, they received "top-notch prices" for their stock; not the new stockholders, because they are accused of making even more profit than they should have made; not the subsequent investors, because they bought with full knowledge of what they were buying; not the shippers, coal miners, farmers and manufacturers along the line of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

road, because they got infinitely better transportation at much lower rates; not the road itself, because it was so improved by Mr. Harriman that its efficiency was more than doubled. Who, then, were the injured? Apparently only Professor Ripley, Theodore Roosevelt, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The only question that remains unsettled is whether Professor Ripley, in his book and in his articles, has accurately presented the facts of the Alton reorganization. My own judgment is that he stated them with reasonable accuracy in the report that he wrote for the U. S. Industrial Commission in 1901, but that he has persistently misstated them ever since the Interstate Commerce Commission began its attack on Mr. Harriman in 1907.

In an address on "Education for Railway Work," delivered September 24, 1915, at the annual meeting of the Commerce School of the Northwestern University, Chicago, Mr. Samuel O. Dunn, editor of the *Railway Age Gazette*, said:

> There is much teaching regarding railway matters in our universities which is not satisfactory. No one has any right to criticize a professor of economics, or of transportation, or of any other subject, for drawing his own conclusions from well authenticated facts, no matter how irrational the conclusions may seem. But the public, the railways, and most of all the students in our schools, have a right to demand that those who assume the responsibility of giving instruction concerning railway matters shall make sure they know the facts about them before they try to teach others. (*Railway Age Gazette*, Nov. 12, 1915).

I feel reasonably certain that when Mr. Dunn made these remarks he did not have in mind the Ropes Professor of Economics in Harvard University; but, if I may make the suggestion with all proper courtesy and respect, Professor Ripley's teaching would be none the worse if he should give to Mr. Dunn's words the serious consideration that they seem to deserve.

In concluding this second review of the Chicago & Alton case, and of Professor Ripley's statements concerning it, I ought, perhaps, to say something with regard to the way in which the federal investigation of 1907 was conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission and its counsel. In an article published in the *Market World & Chronicle* for March, 1915, Major Henry L. Higginson, of Boston, said that the Government should instruct the various Commissioners

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

" not to proceed against corporations as a criminal lawyer proceeds, but as judges, fair-minded, open-minded, and industrious in learning the facts with regard to which they judge." (*N. Y. Evening Post,* March 20, 1915).

Was this the spirit in which the Chicago & Alton investigation was conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission? Certainly not! A correspondent of the London *Economist,* who was present at the taking of testimony in New York, described the proceedings in the following words:

> The members of the Commission surprised many present at the last New York hearing by their manifestly hostile spirit toward Mr. Harriman and witnesses allied with him. It had been imagined that the Commission was there purely to secure such testimony as it might; and that it appreciated the fact that it was in no sense acting as a court having charge of any one accused of crime. Yet, from the manner and form of questions put by several of the Commissioners it is difficult to understand how they regarded it so—if indeed they did. Neither is it any violation of fact to explain that the Commission's lawyers acted toward Mr. Harriman and Mr. Kahn quite as if they were prosecuting attorneys who had at last got before the bar of justice some well known malefactors. Not only did they seek at times to prevent witnesses from replying freely to questions, but they were truthfully accused of seeking to so put questions and so insist upon replies as to leave misleading impressions. (London *Economist,* March 16, 1907).

These words were not written for an American newspaper prepossessed in favor of Mr. Harriman. They were written for one of the best-known financial journals in England, and were to be read by the people of Great Britain. Is it an unfair or unreasonable conclusion from these facts that the Commission and its counsel were not trying to investigate impartially the Chicago & Alton reorganization, but were endeavoring to make out, if possible, a case of criminality against Mr. Harriman? The so-called " investigation " was a one-man hunt, if ever there was one. This fact was well understood by the better informed part of the public, and in June, 1907, the *Economist* said editorially:

> The report was afloat last week that after a conference between the President and the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, it was decided that no violation of law by Mr. Harriman had been discovered under which action could be taken against him. . . It will be too bad for the Government to fail of accomplishing anything after all this talk. If they cannot put him (Mr. Harriman)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through for railroad manipulation, why don't they charge him with carrying concealed deadly weapons, or breaking the Sabbath, or shooting game out of season? Anything to catch him! It won't do to give it up in this weak way. (*The Economist*, Chicago, June 1, 1907).

But if the conviction of Mr. Harriman as a law-breaker was the object of the one-man hunt, it was a complete failure. The Interstate Commerce Commission had to report to the President, as stated by the *Economist*, that "no violation of law by Mr. Harriman had been discovered," and that legal proceedings against him would not be expedient.

It would not be difficult to furnish abundant evidence that the reorganization of the Alton has been persistently misrepresented and generally misunderstood; but one more citation must suffice for the present. No economist in Europe is better acquainted with American railroads than Mr. W. M. Acworth, lecturer in the School of Economics in London. In a review of my "Chicago & Alton Case," published in the London *Economic Journal* for March, 1916, Mr. Acworth says:

> Mr. Kennan writes with studious moderation, and gives chapter and verse for every statement he makes. But he meets the charges of Professor Ripley with so emphatic a contradiction that it would seem that he has not only vindicated the honor of Mr. Harriman, but laid upon Professor Ripley the obligation of defending his own accuracy and scientific impartiality. . . . If the facts be as Professor Ripley has stated, then perhaps his language describing Mr. Harriman as a "conspirator," and his management as "unscrupulous," "piratical," "fraudulent" and "predatory" may not be too strong. But unless he can disprove the facts set forth by Mr. Kennan, it would seem that Professor Ripley has done grievous injury to the memory of a man whose services to the science of railroading will hardly be reckoned, by those who know what his work was, at less than those rendered by George Stephenson himself.

GEORGE KENNAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BRIGHT SIDE OF WAR

BY LAURA SPENCER PORTOR

In these days of widespread anxiety concerning moral issues, we are not likely to undervalue the crimes and horrors of the present war; but we seem to have fallen into the mistake of underestimating the pleasant side of it.

That there *is* a pleasant side, the thoughtful might conjecture if they did but meditate on the mere duration of this, the most appalling conflict of history.

No body of men, however brave or strong, could for so long endure so unparalleled a strain were it a strain of mere misery. Melancholia and madness would carry off a greater number than shrapnel and poisonous gases.

The newspapers and magazines abound in accounts of the human cost of the conflict. We reckon in millions of men and stricken survivors, and billions of money. Thus much has it cost. This is the wreckage.

I do not mean that there has lacked reference to the nobilities of war. There have been some accounts—though few when compared with the accounts of horror and the reckoning of cost—of the beauty of sacrifice among the women, for instance; deeds of individual heroism among the men; stirring accounts of *esprit de corps,* and record of world-wide pity and mercy for a striken Europe, among which, the most poetic was the Christmas Ship of Toys.

Nothing so pretty as the sending of that ship, I venture to say, has ever been done before by any nation. When she takes her place in legend, as I doubt not she will, among the world's fleet of memorable vessels, I can seem to see these others saluting her, from the Argo with Jason and his fellow Argonauts watchful in the bow as she passes, on to the high-pooped Spanish galleons and the little

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Revenge and *Venerable* and the rest; all flying their flags to her, with delight and wonder and a moderate amount of amaze on the bronzed faces of their seamen.

But the Christmas Ship of Toys—that was early in the fight. Then we still had a poetic lift of the heart, and our sorrows were not yet fully upon us. Time has gone since then; and the more sober, if they think of this at all, remember it perhaps still with a covert delight, yet also a little abashed maybe that we should have been caught doing so glad and poetic a thing,—as though the world were still young, instead of old and scarred with unthinkable suffering and tragedy. To some it must have even all the effect of misplaced gaiety in the light of the conflict of today; as though a child were to run laughing into the midst of a solemn death scene to show the dying man a shining bauble.

A melancholy, melancholy thing. So, we dismiss the child, and delegate it to some one who will keep it amused far from death and realities, while we lend ourselves once more to watch, and address ourselves to the real business of life and to its real tragedy. So, the morning paper opens once again to new statistics, of such figures as make the mind reel; and magazines abound with dismal corroboration.

Yet, through all this, some few must have kept, nevertheless, an unshaken faith, and though it were only by the light of their own spirits, must have seen shining from time to time through the darkness the bright side of war; — and by this I mean frankly the actual happiness that comes with war to the legions of soldiers themselves, in such measure as I believe is but rarely or never meted out to men in times of peace.

In Stevenson's *English Admirals* we find this happiness indicated with some insistence. These men he writes of were gifted, decorated, one might say, beyond the common run, by some shining Divinity of War. This Divinity of War, though we credit him with being the most horrible of beings, yet turns out to be, in their instance,—by the circumstantial evidence of their lives,—the most companionable of beings: bearing a cup of some unthinkable ambrosia in his hand, which mounts to men's heads, and makes them gloriously forgetful of mortality, so that they behave themselves as gods.

Stevenson, speaking of the exploits of the English Admirals, first cites Duncan, who, lying off the Texel, with his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own flagship, the *Venerable*, and only one other vessel, heard that the whole Dutch fleet was putting to sea:

> He told Captain Hotham to anchor alongside of him in the narrowest part of the channel, and fight his vessel till she sank. "I have taken the depth of the water," added he, "and when the *Venerable* goes down, my flag will still fly."

Clearly the wine offered him by the War God had gone to his head; and the saying has all the effect of a song sung in warmth of heart and happiness. Stevenson then tells how Nelson went into Aboukir with six colors flying: "so that even if five were shot away, it should not be imagined he had struck. They courted war like a mistress," he says. So, too, Essex, waiting before Cadiz, hearing the attack had been decided, threw his hat into the sea. "It is in this way," says Stevenson, "that a schoolboy hears of a half-holiday; but this was a bearded man of great possessions who had just been allowed to risk his life."

But the most telling testimony at hand is rendered fittingly by the greatest Admiral of them all. The *Culloden*, having been disabled, was unable to take part in the battle of the Nile. Of her Nelson wrote to the Admiralty: "Her misfortune was great in getting aground, *while her more fortunate companions were in the full tide of happiness.*" (Happiness being here synonymous with open battle.)

And of Nelson again, later, at Copenhagen, Stevenson quotes: "A shot through the mainmast knocked the splinters about; and he observed to one of his officers with a smile, 'It is warm work, and this may be the last to any of us at any moment;' and then, stopping short at the gangway, added, with emotion, '*But, mark you—I would not be elsewhere for thousands.*'"

But Stevenson argues from the utilitarian standpoint. These stories are full, he says, of bracing moral influence. This is true, no doubt; but it is, I believe, the smaller part of the account. Example is a noble asset, and no thinking man undervalues it; but it seems to me that an even larger value lies in the *happiness* of the men who fight.

Next—and perhaps lest you fancy that such gallantry as he has cited is peculiar to Admirals—Stevenson relates a humbler instance, the conduct of the four marines of the *Wager*. There was no room for them in the boat, he tells us, and they were left behind on the island to certain death.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They were soldiers, they said, and knew well enough it was their business to die; and as their comrades pulled away, they stood up on the beach, gave three cheers, and cried "God bless the king!"

It is in trying to analyze the motives that lie back of these stirring behaviors that Stevenson comes close upon what I take to be the really bright side of war. He says:

> If the Admirals courted war like a mistress—if, as the drum beat to quarters, the sailors came gaily out of the forecastle—it is because a fight is a period of multiplied and intense experiences, and, by Nelson's computation, worth "thousands" to any one who has a heart under his jacket. If the marines of the *Wager* gave three cheers and cried "God bless the king," it was because they liked to do things nobly for their own satisfaction. They were giving their lives, there was no help for that, and they made it a point of self-respect to give them handsomely. And [the italics are my own] *there were never four happier marines in God's world than these four at that moment. I wish a Benthamite arithmetician would calculate how much it was worth to be one of those four marines.*

There is—I am persuaded past all argument—a spirit of joy which leads all men of the fitter kind into battle. Whether by a dark fate the struggle is carried on against national enemies, fought out with cannon and shrapnel; or whether it be a thing spiritual, a mere personal individual battle fought to the last ditch, does not much matter. To the fit and the strong of spirit, there is a personal happiness to be found in worthy conflict as nowhere else. In biography, in history, this "happiness" stands out indisputable.

One of the most quaint and at the same time impressive examples of it that I know, is to be found in the behavior of England in 1588 when the Spanish peril rose gigantic, colossal, threatening her entire extinction. She was "little" England then. Scotland was not her own; Ireland was more a menace than a help. She had no foreign empire nor colonies at all,—if we except those of Raleigh, foredoomed. Her foe, on the contrary, was the most powerful nation in the world. Added to her power, moreover, was a fanatical religious hatred based on the utmost bigotry of those bigoted times. With these mighty weapons she prepared to annihilate the little kingdom.

There is not need here to recall the effect of this sudden danger on England: the rising and uniting of the people, both Protestant and Catholic, the eager preparation, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

generous donation of funds and energies to the common cause; then the climax of the story, with England triumphant at last over the great crescent moon of the Armada, "which from horn to horn measured some seven miles."

The people of England were happy then, united generously in a common cause, happier perhaps than ever they were in their lives before. The whole thing has the air almost of a holiday occasion.

It is satisfying to find this brighter side recorded in history; heartening to find it memorably recorded in permanent literature; but it were heartening, too, to find it recognized as one of our own glories now, today, in this year of our Lord, in which the world by all reckoning has gone so fatally to wrack, and in which never so many men denied their Maker.

In place of this gladder recognition, we have a world-wide mourning and computing of losses, and a sorrowful shaking of the head. It is a form of egotism, no doubt. We have been disappointed in our times, as men in their children. We had thought we had brought up the world to peace and to certain particular hopes, and lo!—like parents we forget that children sometimes have noteworthy hopes of their own, and must blunder much in attaining them.

Perhaps we drag with us still too much of the old dark, depressing religion of medieval times. I think it likely. It is told on all hands that this war has sent men and women back to the churches (chiefly, of course, it must be the women). To be flung on one's shuddering knees by overwhelming calamity is interpreted, it seems, by the observingly sentimental, as "a great religious revival."

Might we not be better, perhaps, for a leaning toward a sunnier paganism which might bring us closer to the truth?—the truth that there exists a bright side to war; a sunnier paganism which would bring us closer to the truth that, even while spiritually revived women bow mourning in darkened churches before a candle-lit figure of an agonized Christ, those for whom they thus mourn go gallantly, even gaily, to their death, a song upon their lips.

The Greeks, a more temperate people, had a juster view of the inciting nobility of conflict. In their days of peace they also went to the temples, offering gifts and oblations to their gods; but when stern struggle was upon them—be the struggle with men and armaments, or with their own spirits

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—then their gods came, rather, to them. Here it was they had the true companionship of that divinity they knew. Here, while in his shaggy breast Achilles' heart "took counsel, whether in wrath to smite down Atrides, or to smite down rather his own wrath, and master his own spirit"—here it was Athena came and plucked him by the yellow hair. Here, too, the blue-eyed goddess took her place beside Ulysses, and bade him not return to Greece, nor suffer his companions to give up the fight. So "she passed through all the Achaian host, and made their hearts impatient for the march, and strong to endure the combat without pause. For now the war seemed to them dearer than the wished return in their good galleys to the land they loved."

"*This may be the last to any of us at any moment. But mark you I would not be elsewhere for thousands.*" How a sentiment like that spans the deep gulf of centuries for the spirits of heroes to pass back and forth upon at will!

Not all men, certainly, are as boyishly frank as Nelson. There are, I have no doubt, many—very heroic, too—who never admit their own happiness, so paradoxical and out of all reason does it seem to themselves, who see agony upon all sides of them. But that it is there seems to me indisputable. Else, why should they fight so gloriously, and hug a just cause to their hearts, and go singing into battle!

There are those of very definite religious beliefs, hopeful if visionary, who have pictured the spirits of these thousands of mangled bodies, sweeping forth in shining armies, met and welcomed in mid-air pastures of the blessed by sweet St. George and the legions; perhaps the French contingent by their blessed Joan, her white banner flying—that banner she loved so illogically better than her sword because it could kill nobody. It may be; it may be; but all this is beside the point I would make. Such happiness there may be additional. I do not know. I only know that these men who march gallantly, are men sworn—and self-sworn, mark you—to lose their lives; and must of necessity have that happiness in living which accrues to such. Those who have never willingly risked their lives know nothing of the joy of it. They have their experience but by hearsay, and cannot be counted true judges in the matter.

It is not out of keeping that we, who are ourselves not at war, should most loudly mourn the wrack and ruin of the present conflict. Yet give us but a tune to march by, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a stirring rhythm beating upon the drums, and we should give over our lamentations and take on some gladness ourselves, and sing some music-hall tunes, we also, in heroic measure.

We have not yet in this present conflict been touched upon the lips; but we are sentimentalists, taking in the conflict through the eye and ear, like those who, whether by circumstances or temperament or both, have rather looked on at life than been of it; or those who, never having willingly risked their lives, cannot endure the sight of others doing so; who would stop all happiness of heroism because they cannot bear to see blood. It is the sentimentality of the emotional play-goer and novel-reader; and few of us are free from the taint of it.

There are not many of us, I would wager, who can read aloud *The Drums of the Fore and Aft* without a breaking voice, and a stirring in the heart. Not many of us, either, who, if pressed to the wall, would not be forced to admit that these two youngsters, lunging forward to death, and, as they went, fifing and drumming their lost regiment into existence, redeeming in a few brief moments, by an unheard-of-chance, all the coarseness and nastiness of their profane little lives—few of us who must not admit that, like the marines of the *Wager,* there were never two happier children in God's world than this same Jakin and Lew at that moment; yet hardly a one of us, either, who, given the chance, would not have withheld them or dragged them back.

Heroism does not differ, at heart, in any of the centuries, and in this century, in these past two years, there has been a more than ordinary opportunity for it. The real spirit has come amongst us again, passing like blue-eyed Athena with her aegis among the serried ranks of men, touching thousands. It is not now a mere tale to weep over and to stir the heart. These are real men. These are our own. And we have not a word of real joy, it seems, to say about it; there is only mourning and wailing and computing, and what we are pleased to call a "religious revival."

It is some such sentimentality, doubtless, which makes us dote so passionately on heroism in novels and on the stage, yet hold our own back, and call them fools or madmen if they presume to indulge in heroism for themselves. At that we draw the line. It would not surprise me to find Joan of Arc's father to have been a man who listened with especial eagerness to tales of adventure brought him by travelers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there where he dwelt on the cross-roads in the Vosges; a man whose eyes watered readily, and whose heart stirred almost too easily at any tale of heroism or duty performed nobly; even while he cursed his daughter for wanting the more nearby happiness of actual heroism for herself.

I hope I have kept it clear that when I speak of the bright side of war, I have not in mind that "solemn joy" of many women at "having laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of liberty"; nor do I mean the inevitable influence of these men. I leave out of account all the fructifying power of their example.

That is our share, and for us to remember. For us to recall that it is "exhilarating to have lived in the same day with these great-hearted gentlemen." But the larger happiness, the really bright side of war, is, as it is fitting it should be, not for us who are at home, but for them. For them the touch of divinity upon the hair. For them the stirring impatience of the heart strong to endure. For them dearer the conflict than the so dearly wished return.

Crown them, crown them if you like, by airy and spiritual legions. It matters very little. They went into the fight crowned already. Have it, if you will, that some music of heaven rolls forth to meet and compensate them for the bloody field. I like better to remember that they went into battle singing.

Stevenson, in analyzing the content of that bravery which most stirs the heart, declares the finest action to be better for "a piece of purple." It was that the sailors of the *Birkenhead* went down in line, and that the four marines made so gallant a scene of the bestowal of their lives, that gives power to the circumstance. It may be this lends some splendor. But I doubt but the true reason lies deeper than this, more in the companionship, the united gallantry, than in the mere purple. Say what you will, there lacks some glory in that deed which no man shares. The happiness of our heroism must be augmented by the presence of a heroism in others which does not sink below our own, and may easily at any moment rise above it. In our more personal spiritual struggles, too, how much of the joy of conquest is not due to those "shades of all the great and good" which keep us company? Where two or three are gathered together in the name of Honor, asking to be allowed to give their lives nobly, it is not unlikely that Life will grant their request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is perhaps the highest and most stirring form of brotherhood known to man, when large masses under noble danger live up to a common standard of nobility; and meet life not singly, but in whole ranks of noble action, thousands at a time scorning splendidly the "miserable aims that end with self." We talk of widespread brotherhood today, with our faces bowed on our hands, as though it were a thing gone by, and yet here it is all the while beside us, despite death and torment and as never before so powerful.

If those who have followed me lightly, or if those, even, who have read carefully and seriously, find in these words of mine any argument for the maintaining of war, then indeed have I not learned my craft, and would better have laid down my pen before I ever thought to take it up for such a purpose. Those who have known the full horror and suffering of war, even though they have tasted of its glories, cannot wish it back again. There is a limit to the heroism, or the madness, if you like, of even the most madly heroic. We cannot wish such things repeated, not more than we can wish for a renewal of the tragedies and afflictions in our own lives which later turn out to have been the greatest of our spiritual opportunities and the source of our enduring strength. To admit and recognize the bright side of war—the soul side of war—is no cure-all, but, I take it, a mere piece of justice. By such a means the actual horror shall not be swept away, nor the burden of the world fall off suddenly. Even could each one of us realize to the full the deep joy of duty and self-sacrifice nobly rendered, the world would not quite take on gaiety. But only to see life more true—that were something: to make it our concern to keep ourselves and our prejudices and our fine feelings out of our sober judgments; to put by our sentimentality and our tears; and to allow them their happiness—these men who go forth to death with the love of life shining so steadily in their eyes.

I am but one unit in a million, and an inconsiderable person, yet I myself have laid me down to sleep night after night in the face of dire calamity,—as thousands of others have done,—happier than in my days of peace. Why? Is it because one likes or approves, or would encourage and foster, calamity? An idle question, worth only an idle answer. Yet here is an answer not idle: It is because no calamity touches one's life narrowly or singly; it throws one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rather into relation with all the long roll of nobility of all one's fellowmen. It makes of courage a fraternal obligation of the soul. It makes one uniform with one's fellows; allows even the aristocracy to serve in simple khaki in the ranks, and gives all men the need and privilege of saluting their superior officers. The brutalities of war? Yes. Have we not heard enough of them? Are we likely to forget them which are the blackest shame we bear, barring always our insidious brutalities of peace? But what of our nobilities?

A recent author writes: "However high humanity may be raised on the tide of war, it is raised far higher by the lonely heroism of peace, sublime, unapplauded, and without reaction."[1] It is an arbitrary statement, and made, too, as though, despite all the magnificent admitted fraternity of battle, there were no lonely soul on the battlefield dying unapplauded; written, also, as though in peace there were not united warfare.

There are still times, it would seem, when life must be tossed away like a rind that Honor may have the sweet heart of it for its sustenance. The old legend over the three doors: "Be bold", and again "Be bold", and then, over the third, "Be not too bold", might be paraphrased to read: "Love Life"; "Love Life"; "Love Life not too dearly." There comes to mind the French prisoner, arraigned for stealing bread, who made as his plea one that would appeal to many a sentimental heart: "*Ma foi, il faut vivre,*" and the Judge's quick reply: "*Je n'en vois pas la necessité!*"

There are things dearer than life. How long we have recognized and admitted and reiterated that in our legend, our song, our poetry! And there are thousands of men to-day dying happily in recognition of that glorious fact; and we have only wailings with which to salute their passing spirits! And that we may justify ourselves the more, we presume to speak commonly, any and all of us, of Christianity and its failure, and Christlikeness and its eclipse. Of these things we are reminded with sickening regularity. It has become a cheap period in fanfaronnade literature to state tellingly that Christianity has not failed—precisely because it never yet has been tried. O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! —and ye of little faith!

In just how far the cause for which men willingly die is

[1] Winifred Kirkland in *The North American Review*, August, 1915.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

right, only time long hence, perhaps, can tell. They who by their failures instituted this war may have to carry the souls of millions on their consciences; and just how they shall set themselves right with God no man knows. But the willingness of the rank and file to die, to lay down all that is dear to them for what they sincerely believe to be the good of the world—this, it would seem, we might safely admire whenever and however. This I take to be the very essence of Christianity, if Christianity be love of one's fellow-men; and it is written: "Greater love hath no man than this."

That this should all sound strange and paradoxical in face of the large horrors of war does not, I think, invalidate its truth. Life has never ceased to seem paradoxical, even though we apprehend that there may lie, at its center, supreme truth, one and unified. Indeed, that very Christianity which some of us seem to think would leave every problem solved, and the whole world dining and dancing on the village green, even that—no, say, rather, that more than any other word of the spirit—has uttered its truths in paradoxes; the most notable of which, perhaps, concerns him who, saving his life, shall lose it; and him who, losing his life, shall find it.

If I have ignored all the large generalities of war, it is because I believe they have already been dealt with too much. Certainly they must always exhibit a staggering amount of horrors. What I have deplored, rather, is the inaccuracy and sentimentality which allow us to dwell so exclusively on these. The ravens fly cawing to where the dead meat lies. Look at them! Look at them! But the thrush flutes still, from dew-wet underwolds; and the lark still soars upward like a triumphant spirit, singing, singing.

We are still egoists at heart, no doubt. We want the world to think and behave in *our* way, forgetting that thousands of those men who have answered the call to arms have also followed in their spirits a higher vocation, very personal to themselves.

> Where you heard noise and I saw flame,
> Some one man heard God call his name.

This personal call, and the personal answer, and each soul's readiness and each soul's gladness in that answer: these, multiplied by thousands, and you have what may safely and honorably be called the bright side of war.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To leave all this out of our reckoning, to omit it from our inventory: surely, this is to falsify the accounts. And, where the priceless spiritual riches involved concern the spiritual wealth not alone of whole nations, but of our common humanity at large, God forbid that in the egotism and sentimentality of our hearts we should continue such falsifying! Let us reckon the loss of the war—it is fitting we should do so; but in justice to those who have bequeathed such riches to us and with so much largeness of spirit, let us not undervalue or ignore the immeasurable gain.

Let us talk no more for a while of those who are to blame for this conflict; or let us admit largely that humanity itself is to blame—humanity old and tricky, and cheating itself to the end; and let us remember, rather, in the night watches, how the flower of the world was still the flower of the world, even more delicate, more lovely, more glad, in the face of the black over-reaching tempest bent upon the devastation that was to lay it low.

LAURA SPENCER PORTOR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A STANDARD OF SPOKEN ENGLISH

BY BRANDER MATTHEWS

"WHAT is it that constitutes and makes man what he is?" Huxley asked in his discussion of *Man's Place in Nature*. "What is it but his power of language,—that language giving him the means of recording his experience, making every generation somewhat wiser than its predecessor, more in accordance with the established order of the universe?" Animals may have their simpler methods of conveying information and of communicating emotion, but man alone has developed the faculty of articulate speech which preceded and made possible the development of writing and of printing.

In these days when the printing press is omnipresent, it seems to many to be omnipotent; and they are often inclined to consider the spoken word less useful and less important than the written. Yet this is a mistaken view, for speech not only came into being before writing, it is even now many times more abundant. Most of the business of life is still transacted by word of mouth. The telephone is daily gaining on its rivals, the telegraph and the post-office; and now the typewriter is becoming subservient to the dictaphone. Even in literature, although history has long ceased to be an oral art akin to oratory, poetry does not come into its own until it is said or sung, making its ultimate appeal to the ear; and the drama is incomplete and comparatively inert until the give-and-take of its dialogue is endowed with life by the voice of the actor.

"The spoken word is first in order and in dignity, since the written word is only its image, as the other is the image of the thought itself," so asserted Vaugelas, the regulator of usage in France nearly three centuries ago. And Socrates more than twenty centuries earlier used the same figure,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

insisting that writing is the mere image or phantom of the living and animated word. The Greek philosopher asserted the abiding superiority of the spoken word over the written, since the latter—as Butcher summarized the objections—"has no power of adaptation; it speaks in one voice to all; it cannot answer questions, correct misunderstandings or supplement its own omissions." Here the inventor of the Socratic method is a little too emphatic, in so far at least as he may seem to suggest an inferiority of writing to speaking so complete as to render any record useless. Although Socrates chose to express himself solely in speech, it is by the pages of Plato that his weighty utterances have been preserved for our profit.

There is no need now to dispute over the utility of the rival methods of human communication; each has its own opportunity. Writing is the more durable, but speaking is the more individual, since we write for others, more often than not, whereas we speak rather for ourselves, in response to an uncontrollable need. Thus it is that there is likely to be a wider divergence in the speech of one man from that of another than there is in their respective writings. If a highlander of Scotland and a mountaineer of Georgia were to meet, they would find in their several pronunciations and intonations a higher barrier to the interchange of information than they would discover if they were communicating with one another only by letter. The well-educated New Yorker and the well-educated Londoner when they take pen in hand are distinguishable by only a few localisms of vocabulary and usage; yet when they converse face to face their respective domiciles are likely to become instantly discoverable.

In his illuminating discussion of the many misguided efforts of dictionary-makers to declare an indisputable standard of English pronunciation, Lounsbury quoted Hawthorne as declaring that the pronunciation of *been* is an unfailing test of the nativity of a speaker, the Briton rhyming it to *seen* and the American to *sin*. Lounsbury also cited A. J. Ellis as preferring, for the test, *trait*, which we on this side of the Atlantic have frankly Anglicized, rhyming it to *straight*, whereas our kin across the sea have chosen to preserve the original French sound, rhyming it to *stray*. Lounsbury himself suggested that *schedule* is better fitted to serve as a shibboleth between the two greater divisions of the Eng-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lish-speaking peoples, since it is almost the universal custom of Americans to say *skedule* and of the British to say *shedule*. Other observers might readily find other words in which British usage and American do not agree, although there is not the rigid uniformity on either side of the Western Ocean that Hawthorne and Ellis asserted.

It has often been urged as an argument against all effort to regularize our chaotic orthography, and to encourage our spelling to conform a little less clumsily to our pronunciation, that any attempt in this direction is but an idle dream, since there is now no universally accepted pronunciation to which a simpler and more logical orthography could adjust itself naturally. There is no need to deny that this is a plausible objection; yet it will not withstand examination. True it is that there is nowhere to be found an inexpugnable authority having power to declare absolutely a final standard of pronunciation; and true it is also that there are many divergencies of utterance—national, sectional, local and individual; yet this diversity is far less than might be supposed. A large part of it is unconscious and would be denied indignantly by a majority of those who are guilty of it. Men whose pronunciation may be slovenly to the very verge of illiteracy are often unaware of their linguistic delinquencies; and many of them would be greatly shocked if they could hear with their own ears an exact reproduction of their habitual utterances. The majority of us recognize that there is a normal pronunciation, and we fondly believe that we conform to it. Indeed, when we speak in public, we generally make a strenuous effort to eliminate our personal peculiarities and to attain to the standard that we accept.

Now, if there is no authority to declare this standard, what is the normal pronunciation which we all more or less recognize and to which we seek to conform? How can there be any ideal uniformity of pronunciation between the British and the Americans? How could it exist in the United States when we can all of us distinguish at once the New Englander from the New Yorker, the man from the Middle West from the man from the Central South? And how could any such thing exist in Great Britain when everybody is aware of the very marked differences of speech between the Scotsman and the Yorkshireman, the Irishman and the Welshman, the cockney costermonger and the Oxford don? And then there are also the outlying possessions of the British Empire:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there is Australia, with its habits of speech modified by a climate very different from that which affects the utterances of the inhabitants of Canada. When we consider all these factors of the problem we are tempted to echo the remark of Old Bill Allen of Ohio not long after the Civil War, when he declared that the resumption of specie payments "is a damned barren ideality!"

And yet we may take heart when we remember that only a few years later specie payments were resumed, and without any great difficulty. We may find encouragement also in the fact that the condition of English pronunciation is scarcely worse than that of French or German, Italian or Spanish.

In fact, when we inquire more closely we discover that the situation in Spanish is not unlike that in English, since Spanish also is spoken by millions who no longer dwell in the land where the language came to its maturity; and yet the Spaniards have succeeded in establishing a standard of pronunciation and in adopting a spelling which is substantially phonetic. In one of his addresses as president of the Simplified Spelling Board, Professor Grandgent reminded his hearers that "Spanish is, like English, a world-language, and its vast territory contains many varieties of current usage." Then he asked:

> Upon what type is the spelling based? According to history, ancient tradition and present sentiment, the official speech of Spain and her offshoots is Castilian; and a sort of purified Castilian—more consistent and conservative than that which is now heard in the streets of Madrid—is the kind of Spanish represented by the common orthography and regarded as a more or less remote ideal by the several Spanish provinces and nations. It must be confessed that in some of the countries of South America and even in Iberian Andalusia . . . the ideal is so remote as to be in danger of vanishing from the general consciousness. . . . But as long as the standard pronounciation is even vaguely present in the mind of a speaker, the orthography may, for that speaker, be called phonetic, though his practise depart never so far from the ideal.

Just as Castilian is accepted as the standard of Spanish, so Tuscan is accepted as the standard of Italian,—a language in which the orthography is also almost completely phonetic. No Italian child and no Spanish child is ever tortured by unremunerative toiling over a spelling-book. Yet the divergencies of the local dialects in various parts of Italy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the Tuscan which is recognized as the ideal pronunciation are wider and more numerous than the corresponding divergencies in English. In the United States and in the British Empire education is more widespread than in Italy or Spain or Spanish America; and wherever the schoolmaster is abroad there is an incessant pressure upon plastic youth to conform to the standard. Even if this conformity remains pitiably incomplete, at least there has been implanted a definite recognition of the existence of a norm and also an abiding respect for it.

As education is more thorough in France and in Germany than it is in Italy or in Spain, there has been a more striking success in imposing upon the French and the Germans a regard for the more or less remote ideal. In France, this ideal is found in the pronunciation of Paris,—although there are those who are wont to contend for the superior purity of the speech of Tours. Of course, this ideal is not the casual and careless utterance of the average Parisian; it is that religiously conserved on the stage of the Théâtre Français. Years ago a highly cultivated teacher of French residing in New York told me that he felt it his duty to spend at least every other summer in assiduous attendance on the performances of the Comédie-Française that he might recover the felicities of accent for which his ear was likely to be blunted by too constant association with his American pupils, from whom he was in danger of acquiring perversities of pronunciation which demanded periodical eradication.

France has adopted as its standard an idealization of the speech of Paris, just as Spain has accepted an idealization of the speech of Madrid. But Germany has no capital; Berlin may assert itself, but Dresden and Munich refuse to admit the supremacy of the Prussian metropolis; and a plea is often heard in behalf of Hanover as a city possessing a superior purity of speech,—a plea akin to that advanced for Tours. In the long centuries when Germany was only a geographical expression, it could not possess a capital with the centralizing attraction of Paris and Madrid; and even since the creation of the German Empire, the other large cities are a little inclined to deride Berlin as an upstart, as an overgrown village, owing its unexpected expansion to a political accident.

The necessity for a standard of pronunciation was keenly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

felt in Germany, even if it could not be attained by the idealization of any local speech; and the problem of creating it was solved with Teutonic thoroughness. The exciting cause of the action finally taken was the disastrous effect of a heterogeny of local divergencies of pronunciation observable in the performances of the classics of the German drama, even when these were given by the carefully chosen and conscientiously trained companies of the court theaters. The Germans take the stage seriously, to their honor be it said; and the advantage of adopting a unified pronunciation for the use of actors at least was obvious to all lovers of the drama, who were continually in danger of having their attention distracted from the poetry of Schiller by jarring usages, often justified by irreconcilable traditions.

Professor Grandgent has kindly supplied me with an account of the steps taken to establish a standard German for the stage. In 1896 it was proposed to appoint a commission consisting of actors, managers and linguistic scholars; and the suggestion was approved in the following year by the General Superintendent of Royal Plays in Berlin, Graf von Hochberg, and by the German Philological Association. A committee of eleven was constituted in 1898, five professors representing the experts in language and six other members representing the actors and managers, chosen by the *Deutscher Bühnenverein.* Its recommendations were cordially received. As a result of this application of the methods of scientific efficiency to a linguistic difficulty, there is now an authoritative *Bühnenaussprache,* a German equivalent of the French pronunciation piously preserved by the Comédie-Française.

"It is universal suffrage which rules a language," so Sainte-Beuve reminded us; "and no dictator has any authority." Yet a majority of those interested may be quite willing to abide by the decisions of a dictator-committee composed of disinterested experts; and there might be profit for us who have English for our mother-tongue if we were to follow this German example and to constitute an American-British commission of actors and linguistic experts to suggest a preference in all those cases where the pronunciation is in dispute. It must be noted, however, that the need for an artificially agreed upon uniformity is not so obvious among the English-speaking peoples as it was in the German-speaking countries. For reasons partly historical and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

partly literary—the early emergence of London as the capital and Chaucer's choice of its court-dialect—we had a consciousness of a normal grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation centuries before this was possible in Germany, which was for generations fragmentary and politically centrifugal, lacking until very late the cohesive form of a vital literature.

Even now the condition of spoken English is more satisfactory than that of spoken German, in spite of the recent establishment of the *Deutscher Bühnenaussprache*. It is true that Mr. Robert Bridges, poet-laureate, has recently held up his hands in holy horror at the vulgarian atrocities, the distortions and dislocations recorded by the British phoneticians; and it is true also that Mr. Henry James, in one of his flying visits to his native land, was so profoundly shocked by the slovenly utterances which fell upon his refined ear that he "loosed the fateful lightning of his wrath." Nevertheless the assertion may be ventured that no competent observer could fail to find the speech of the average Briton or American of fair education less open to adverse criticism than the speech of the average German of equivalent instruction.

To say this is not to deny that there are dialectic and personal peculiarities audible both in Great Britain and the United States. The New Yorkers are as prompt to detect what we call the "British accent" as the Londoners are to recognize what they term the "American twang." Yet there are not a few speakers of our tongue, born on one side of the Atlantic or the other, who are almost altogether free from localisms of intonation and pronunciation. The tongue they speak is English at its best—not British and not American. I recall that I first noticed this a third of a century ago, when I attended the dinner given in London to Henry Irving on the eve of his first visit to the United States in 1883. Lord Coleridge presided, and Lowell made one of the happiest of his addresses,—and while either of them was speaking the ears of the listeners were delighted by an English exquisite in its choice of words and delicately harmonious in its intonations. What Lord Coleridge and Lowell spoke was English pure and simple, not betraying itself as either British or American.

Of course, spoken English of this ultimate excellence is not common,—any more than the spoken French of Coquelin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or the spoken German of Barnay; it could not but be rare, and therefore the more precious. Probably because my opportunities have been more frequent in the United States than in Great Britain I should include more Americans than Britons on the list of those who have achieved it. I should enroll the name of President Eliot and not that of President McCosh. I should include John Hay and George William Curtis and not Matthew Arnold (who slighted his terminal *g's*) or Andrew Lang (whose early lowland Scotch was overlaid by later linguistic habits acquired in Oxford). I should leave off Henry Irving, as having been too individual, and I should put on the name of Edwin Booth. I should exclude Clara Morris and Lawrence Barrett and I should include Agnes Booth and Herman Vezin. From among the more prominent actors and actresses of today it would be impossible not to inscribe upon the roll Ellen Terry, Julia Marlowe, Forbes-Robertson, John Drew, Otis Skinner and George Arliss. But I must beg to be excused from the invidious task of singling out certain other contemporary actors and actresses of Great Britain and the United States who fail conspicuously to attain to this international standard.

Fortunately, the compassing of this lofty ideal is not strictly necessary in the presentation of the ordinary drama of the day dealing with a theme more or less local to one country or the other; it is not needed even when the original company transports the piece across the Atlantic. It is even possible that an occasional spectator in London might feel that he had not got his money's worth if he failed to recognize the expected American twang in one or more performers in an exclusively American cast of a characteristically American play; and in like manner the theatergoer of New York is quite as tolerant towards Briticisms of enunciation when he is beholding the representation of a British comedy by an exclusively British company as he is to the Briticisms of phrase which may besprinkle the dialogue of the piece itself, —locutions as unfamiliar to American ears as "Aren't I?" and "Directly I arrived." In fact, the localisms of phrase, like the corresponding localisms of pronunciation, might very well be defended by an ardent advocate of realism as helpful adjuncts to local color and as stricter approximations to the actual facts.

On the other hand, American and British audiences are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alike in desiring and even demanding a standardization of speech in the performance of plays of a larger import, wherein the actual fact yields to the essential truth. In any representation of the English classics, the tragedies of Shakespeare or the comedies of Sheridan, and in any performance of translations of foreign masterpieces, the psychological fantasies of Maeterlinck or the social dramas of Ibsen, we expect uniformity of pronunciation, and we are annoyed when our attention is distracted by inconsistencies in uttering *been* and *trait* and *schedule,* which reveal to us at once that the utterer is not a man of another time or another land, but provokingly British or American.

It is therefore a good augury for the future to discover that so conscientious and so competent an observer as Professor Grandgent takes a very hopeful view of the outlook:

> Dramatic tours, carrying actors from end to end of the English-speaking world, have made the approved practises of each great section familiar to every other part; while transference of performers from company to company and from country to country has worked for the establishment of an international theatrical standard. In the best performances of serious drama it is now often impossible for a spectator to tell whether a given actor is British or American.

That is to say, these performers have succeeded in shedding whatever local peculiarities of pronunciation and of enunciation they may have originally possessed. No longer do they speak British-English or American-English; they speak English pure and simple, as did Lord Coleridge and Lowell. And this should be an ideal for all of us, whether native to these United States or to any part of the British Empire.

BRANDER MATTHEWS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WORKMANSHIP OF "AS YOU LIKE IT"

BY SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH.

For the actual plot of *As You Like It* we have not to seek very far. Shakespeare took his story from a contemporary novel, *Rosalynde, Euphues' Golden Legacie,* written by Thomas Lodge and first published in 1590. Lodge derived a good part of his story from the *Tale of Gamelyn,* included in some MSS of the *Canterbury Tales,* but certainly not written by Chaucer and probably packed by him among his papers as material for the *Yeoman's Tale* which he never wrote.[1]

The *Tale of Gamelyn* (as perhaps you remember) runs in this fashion:

> Litheth and lesteneth || and herkeneth aright,
> And ye schulle heere a talking || of a doughty knight;
> Sire Johan of Boundys || was his righte name . . .

and he leaves three sons. The eldest, succeeding to the estate, misuses the youngest brother, who triumphs in a

[1] On this I cannot do better than quote Professor Skeat:

"Some have supposed, with great reason, that this tale occurs among the rest because it is one which Chaucer intended to recast, although in fact, he did not live to rewrite a single line of it. This is the more likely because the tale is a capital one in itself, well worthy of being rewritten even by so great a poet; indeed, it is well known that the plot of the favorite play known to us all by the title of *As You Like It* was derived from it at second-hand. But I cannot but protest against the stupidity of the botcher whose hand wrote above it, "The Coke's Tale of Gamelyn." This was done because it happened to be found *next after* the "Coke's Tale. . . . The fitness of things ought to show at once that this "Tale of Gamelyn," a tale of the woods in true Robin Hood style, could only have been placed in the mouth of him "who bare a mighty bow," and who knew all the ways of wood-craft; in one word, of the Yeoman. . . . And we get hence the additional hint, that the Yeoman's Tale was to have followed the Coke's Tale, a tale of fresh country life succeeding one of the close back-streets of the city. No better place could be found for it."

I am sure that Skeat was right.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wrestling-bout and, escaping to the greenwood with an old retainer, Adam the Spencer, becomes an outlaw. The eldest brother, Johan, as sheriff, pursues him—just as "the proud sheriff of Nottingham" pursues Robin Hood. He is taken, and bailed; returns, in ballad-fashion (like the Heir of Linne, for example), just in time to save his bail, and the wicked Johan is sent to the gallows.

Upon this artless ballad Lodge tacked and embroidered a love-story—of an exiled King of France and of his daughter, Rosalind, who falls in love with the young wrestler, and escapes with the usurper's daughter Alinda (Celia) to the greenwood. As in the play, the usurper's daughter becomes "Aliena" and Rosalind disguises herself as a page and calls herself "Ganymede." The name of the faithful old retainer, "Adam," persists down from *The Tale of Gamelyn* to *As You Like It*, and is the name of the character which (tradition says) Shakespeare as an actor personated in his own play.

So much for the source of the plot. But the plot of *As You Like It* is no great matter. Indeed, I would point out that by the end of Act i it is practically over and done with. With the opening of Act ii we reach the Forest of Arden; and thenceforth, like the exiled Duke and his followers, we "fleet the time carelessly, as they did in the golden world." But let me quote the whole of Charles the Wrestler's answer to Oliver's question, "Where will the old Duke live?"; for in some five lines it gives us not only the Robin Hood and Gamelyn tradition of the story but the atmosphere in which Shakespeare is to clothe it:

> They say he is already in the forest of Arden, and a many merry men with him; and there they live like the old Robin Hood of England: they say many young gentlemen flock to him every day, and fleet the time carelessly, as they did in the golden world.

"They say . . . they say"—I note those two "they says," to return to them anon. For the moment let us be content to mark that no sooner do we arrive at the fringe of this forest with the other fugitives (and I break off to remark that they all in turn reach it dead-beat. Sighs Rosalind, "O Jupiter, how weary are my spirits!" invoking Jupiter as a Ganymede should. Touchstone retorts, "I care not for my spirits, if my legs were not weary"; and Celia entreats, "I pray you, bear with me; I cannot go

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

further:" as, later on, old Adam echoes, "Dear master, I can go no further"; and again, you will remember, Oliver arrives footsore, in rags, and stretches himself to sleep, so dog-tired that even a snake, coiling about his throat, fails to awaken him. It is only the young athlete Orlando who bears the journey well)—I say that the fugitives, and we too, no sooner win to the forest than life is found to have changed its values for us, as it has awhile already for the Duke and his followers. Henceforth we hear next to nothing of the usurping Duke Ferdinand and his court, and we care less. We have left him behind. He is not suffered again to obtrude his person, and in the last Act we learn of his repentance but by report:

> Duke Frederick, hearing how that every day
> Men of great worth resorted to this forest,
> Address'd a mighty power; which were on foot,
> In his own conduct, purposely to take
> His brother here and put him to the sword:
> And to the skirts of this wild wood he came;
> Where meeting with an old religious man,
> After some questioning with him, was converted
> Both from his enterprise and from the world;
> His crown bequeathing to his banish'd brother,
> And all their lands restored to them again
> That were with him exiled.

"I do not perceive the use of this hermit," says Dr. Johnson of the holy man introduced with very similar abruptness into the last Act of *The Merchant of Venice*. I venture to echo it of this intruder upon the last Act of *As You Like It*. Whoso lists may believe in him. But who cares?

The wicked brother Oliver is even more violently converted to a right frame of mind, by means of a snake and a lion. We are not shown it. We don't want to see it: we take his word for it, and quite cheerfully, in spite of its monstrous improbability. For, again, who cares? *We* are fleeting the time carelessly; we are "not at home" to him, but engaged with Rosalind's wooing, Touchstone's amorous vagaries with his Audrey, the pure pastoral of Silvius and Phebe, Jaques' moralizing, the killing of the deer, food and song beneath the bough.

Some years ago, in hope to get a better understanding of Shakespeare, a friend and I tracked the Warwickshire Avon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

together, from its source on Naseby battlefield down to Tewkesbury, where, by a yet more ancient battlefield, it is gathered to the greater Severn. From Naseby, where we found its source among the "good cabbage" of an inn-garden, we followed it afoot through "wide-skirted meads," past "poor pelting villages, sheep-cotes and farms," to Rugby. This upper region of Avon undulates in long ridge and furrow divided by stiff ox-fences (the "bull-finches" of the fox-hunter—for this is the famous Pytchley country); and in Shakespeare's time these same ridges and furrows were mainly planted with rye. We went down through this pastoral heart of England, where yet (as Avon draws the line between her north and her south) so many of her bloody internal battles have been decided—Bosworth and Naseby by her headwaters, Evesham and Tewkesbury by her lower fords—and at Rugby we took ship: that is to say, we launched a canoe.

I am pretty sure she was the first ever launched upon Avon from Rugby. A small curious crowd bore murmured testimony to this. The Avon is not—or was not in those days—a pleasure stream. You might meet a few boats, above Warwick, a few at Stratford. Far lower down, below Stratford, the river was made navigable in 1637. But the locks are decayed, and the waterway disused. I suppose that along its extent, half the few houses by this most lovely river resolutely turn their back gardens on it.

On the second day, after much pulling through reed beds and following for many miles Avon's always leisurely meanders, we ported over Bubbenhall weir, fetched north-east, then south-east, and came to the upper bridge of Stoneleigh Deer Park.

A line of swinging deer-fences hung from the arches of the bridge, the river trailing between their bars. We, having permission, pushed cautiously under these—which in a canoe was not easy. Beyond the barrier we looked to right and left, amazed. We had passed from a sluggish brook, twisting among water-plants and willows, to a pleasant river, expanding down between wide lawns, by slopes of bracken, by the roots of gigantic trees—oaks, Spanish oaks, wych-elms, stately firs, sweet chestnuts, backed by filmy larch coppices.

This was Arden, the forest of Arden, actually Stoneleigh-in-Arden, and Shakespeare's very Arden.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Actually, as we rested on our paddles, down to a shallow ahead—their accustomed ford, no doubt—a herd of deer came daintily and charged across, splashing; first the bucks, in single file, then the does in a body. The very bed of Avon changes just here: the river now brawling by a shallow, now sliding over slabs of sandstone.

This (I repeat) is verily and historically Arden. We know that Arden—a lovely word in itself—was endeared to Shakespeare by scores of boyish memories; Arden was his mother's maiden name. I think it arguable of the greatest creative artists that, however they learn and improve, they are always trading on the stored memories of childhood. I am sure that, as Shakespeare turned the pages of Lodge's *Rosalynde,*—as sure as if my ears heard him,—he cried to himself, "Arden? This made to happen in a Forest of Arden, in France? But I have wandered in a Forest of Arden ten times lovelier; and, translated thither, ten times lovelier shall be the tale!"

And he is in such a hurry to get to it!

The opening Act of *As You Like It* (you will note) abounds in small carelessness of detail. Rosalind is taller than Celia in one passage, shorter in another: a name, "Jaques," is bestowed on an unimportant character, forgotten, and later used again for an important one; in one passage there is either confusion in the names of the two Dukes, exiled and regnant, or the words are given to the wrong speaker. Orlando's protasis is a mere stage trick; and the persiflage between Rosalind and Celia has a false sparkle. Actually it is dull, level, chop-logic, repetitive in the rhythm of its sentences. In fact, the whole of the language of this Act, when you weigh it carefully, is curiously monotonous. It affects to be sprightly, but lacks true wit. Until he gets to Arden, Touchstone never finds himself. All goes to show that Shakespeare, while laying out his plot, was impatient of it and ardent for Arden.

Now, in Stoneleigh Deer Park in Arden I saw the whole thing, as though Corin's crook moved above the ferns, and Orlando's ballads fluttered on the boles. There was the very oak beneath which Jaques moralized on the deer—a monster, thirty-nine feet around (for I measured it), not far above the ford across which the herd had splashed, its "antique roots" writhing over the red sandstone rock down to the water's brim. And I saw the whole thing for what the four

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

important Acts of it really are—not as a drama, but as a dream, or rather a dreamy delicious fantasy, and especially a fantasy in color.

I want to make this plain: and that the play, not my criticism, is fanciful. I had always thought of *As You Like It*—most adorable play of boyhood and then not second even to *The Tempest*—in terms of color, if I may so put it. I mean this: Shakespeare, improving on Lodge, invented Jaques and Touchstone. Both are eminently piquant figures under the forest boughs; both piquantly out of place, while most picturesquely in place; both critics, and contrasted critics, of the artificial-natural life ("the simple life" is our term nowadays) in which the exiled Duke and his courtiers profess themselves to revel. Hazlitt says of Jaques that "he is the only purely contemplative character in Shakespeare." Well, with much more going on about him, Horatio, in *Hamlet*, is just as inactive—the static, philosophical man, the *punctum indifferens* set in the midst of tragic aberrations. This function of the critic amid the comic aberrations of *As You Like It*, Jaques and Touchstone share between them. Jaques moralizes; Touchstone comments and plays the fool, his commentary enlightening common sense, his folly doing common sense no less service by consciously caricaturing all prevalent folly around it.

Now, as contrast of character indicated by color, can you conceive anything better than Jaques' sad-colored habit opposed to Touchstone's gay motley? With what a whoop of delight the one critic happens on the other!—

> A fool, a fool! I met a fool i' the forest,
> A motley fool; a miserable world!
> As I do live by food, I met a fool;
> Who laid him down and bask'd him in the sun,
> And rail'd on Lady Fortune in good terms,
> In set good terms, and yet a motley fool.
> "Good morrow, fool," quoth I. "No, sir," quoth he,
> Call me not fool till heaven hath sent me fortune:
> And then he drew a dial from his poke,
> And looking on it with lack-lustre eye,
> Says very wisely, "It is ten o'clock:
> Thus we may see," quoth he, "how the world wags:
> 'Tis but an hour ago since it was nine;
> And after one hour more 'twill be eleven;
> And so, from hour to hour, we ripe and ripe,
> And then, from hour to hour, we rot and rot;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And thereby hangs a tale." When I did hear
The motley fool thus moral on the time,
My lungs began to crow like chanticleer,
That fools should be so deep contemplative;
And I did laugh sans intermission
An hour by his dial. O noble fool!
A worthy fool! Motley's the only wear.

Duke S. What fool is this?

Jaques. . . . . One that hath been a courtier,
And says, if ladies be but young and fair,
They have the gift to know it: and in his brain,
Which is as dry as the remainder biscuit
After a voyage, he hath strange places cramm'd
With observation, the which he vents
In mangled forms. O that I were a fool!
I am ambitious for a motley coat.

Well then, to pass from Jaques' to our own appreciation of motley, do you not see Touchstone's suit—scarlet, we will say, down one side, and green down the other—illustrating his own contrast of wit and conduct, in speech after speech! Take, for example, his answer to Corin's query, "And how like you this shepherd's life, Master Touchstone?" and see him exhibiting one side of himself, then the other:

Truly, shepherd, in respect of itself, it is a good life; but in respect that it is a shepherd's life, it is naught. In respect that it is solitary, I like it very well; but in respect that it is private, it is a very vile life. Now, in respect it is in the fields, it pleaseth me well; but in respect it is not in the court, it is tedious. As it is a spare life, look you, it suits my humor; but as there is no more plenty in it, it goes much against my stomach.

The comedy, then, is less a comedy of dramatic event than a playful fantastic criticism of life: wherein, a courtly society being removed to the greenwood, to picnic there, the Duke Senior can gently moralize on the artificiality he has left at home, and his courtiers—being courtiers still, albeit loyal ones—must ape his humors. But this in turn, being less than sincere, needs salutary mockery: wherefore Shakespeare invents Jaques and Touchstone, critics so skillfully opposed, to supply it. But yet again, Jaques' cynicism being something of a pose, he must be mocked at by the Fool; while the Fool, being professionally a fool, must be laughed at by Jaques, and, being betrayed to real folly by human weakness, laughed at by himself. Even Rosalind, being in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

love, must play with it. Even honest Orlando, being in love, must write ballads and pin them on oaks; but he writes them so very ill that we must allow him honest. Otherwise I should maintain his ancient servant Adam (whose part Shakespeare himself enacted) to be the one really serious figure on the stage. It is at any rate observable that while, as we should expect, the play contains an extraordinary number of fanciful and more or less rhetorical moralizings—such as the Duke's praise of a country life, Jaques' quoted sermon on the wounded deer and his "All the world's a stage," Rosalind's lecture on the marks of a lover, Touchstone on the virtue in an "If," on the Lie Circumstantial, and on horns (to name but a few), it is Orlando who speaks out from the heart such poetry as:

> . . . . . whate'er you are
> That in this desert inaccessible,
> Under the shade of melancholy boughs,
> Lose and neglect the creeping hours of time;
> If ever you have look'd on better days,
> If ever been where bells have knoll'd to church,
> If ever sat at any good man's feast,
> If ever from your eyelids wiped a tear
> And know what 'tis to pity and be pitied,
> Let gentleness my strong enforcement be . .

while to Adam it falls to utter the sincerest, most poignant, line in the play:

> And unregarded age in corners thrown.

An exquisite instance of Shakespeare's habitual stroke!—with which the general idea, "unregarded age," is no sooner presented than (as it were) he stabs the concrete into it, drawing blood: "unregarded age in corners thrown."

But in truth all the rest of our bright characters are not in earnest. They do but *play* at life in Arden. As Touchstone knew, "cat will after kind"; and, as Shakespeare knew, the world is the world as man made it for man to live in it. These courtiers are not *real* Robin Hoods. If they fleet the time carelessly, it is (I suspect) much as people do at Letchworth. No: when the *ducdame, ducdame* has been played out, yet not so as to be over-wearied, Shakespeare gathers up his courtiers—as afterwards in *The Tempest* he gathered up the Neapolitan courtiers—and restores them, like so many fish, to their proper element;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

even as he himself, after living with shows and making himself a motley to the view, returned to his native Stratford, bought land, and lived doucely. The Duke regains his dukedom, his followers are restored to their estates. By a pretty turn of workmanship, Orlando, who started with a patrimony of "poor a thousand crowns," dependent on an unjust brother, returns as heir apparent and that brother's prospective liege-lord. By an equally pretty turn of irony, the one man—the usurping Duke—who reaches Arden on his own impulse, moved by a ferocious idea to kill somebody, is the only one left there in the end, when the sentimental moralists have done with it, to use it as a school of religious contemplation.

Some critics have held it for a blot on the play that Oliver, his brotherly crime condoned, is allowed to marry a Celia. Shakespeare merely neglects the excuse found for it in Lodge's story, where the repentant elder brother helps to rescue Aliena (Celia) from a band of robbers. It *is* unsatisfactory, if we will. The play, according to Swinburne, would be perfect "were it not for that one unlucky slip of the brush which has left so ugly a little smear in one corner of the canvas as the betrothal of Oliver to Celia." And George Sand, in her French adaptation, like the bold woman she was, married Celia to—Jaques!

But "perfect," after all, is a word I would like to keep in hand for perfection: and full though *As You Like It* is of life and gaiety and exquisite merriment, on other points than Oliver's betrothal (I have instanced the mechanical introduction, and the rather pointless chop-logic of the First Act), it does not quite reach perfection. And, after all, a fantasy is a fantasy, and forgiveness Christian. I cannot feel my soul greatly perturbed over the mercy shown to Oliver; and I will give Celia to him, any day of the week, to save her from Jaques. The only possible wife for Jaques was one that Shakespeare omitted to provide. She should have to be an arrant shrew, to talk him dumb: and so he and Touchstone might have expiated their criticism together on a fair balance of folly. Rosalind herself would have cured him; but Rosalind, of course, is by miles too good for Jaques. She is reserved to be loved by an honest man his life through; and, like many another dear woman, to nag him, his life through.

Rosalind herself is not perfect; but she is in a way the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

better for it, being adorable: at once honest and wayward, "true brow and fair maid," and infinitely tantalizing. She means to be the Nut Brown Maid of the Greenwood, as the whole play seems trying, over and again, to be a Robin Hood play. She means this, I say; but being courtly bred she has to play with it before admitting it. Yet she is honest, and confesses her love almost from the first to herself and to Celia. She does not, as Imogen does, lift the heart out of us, ready to break for her: but she bewitches us, and hardly the less because all the while she allows us to know that the witchery is conscious, intentional.

The play is—as you like it—a woodland play treated courtly-wise, or a courtly play treated woodland-wise. It plainly derives, through *Love's Labour's Lost,* from John Lyly; whose polite comedies, highly artificial, but in one way or another a wonderful artistic advance, held the ear of Court and of City at the moment when Shakespeare set up as a playwright: and I hold that Mr. Warwick Bond, Lyly's learned and devoted editor, makes out unanswerably Shakespeare's debt to Lyly as he was learning dramatic architecture. Mr. Bond says:

> That Shakespeare was his [Lyly's] disciple in this respect is beyond a doubt.. . . To the fundamental brainwork which Lyly put into his plays, the greater poet and the Shakespearean stage in general are almost as much indebted as they are to his introduction of a lively, witty and coherent dialogue.

Lyly's notion of a lively and witty dialogue, though begotten (I make no doubt) of an instinct for reform, resulted —like many another innovation—in a tyranny of its own making; and to my taste the dreariest passages in Shakespeare are those in which his ladies and courtiers exchange "wit." But it remains true that if we would understand Shakespeare's workmanship in the early Comedies, and trace how *Love's Labour's Lost* grew into *As You Like It,* we must study Lyly's *Campaspe,* his *Endymion* and his *Galatea.* The main point to grasp is that *As You Like It,* however much improved by genius, belongs to the Lyly line of descent and to the order of the court-pastoral.

The "pastoral" being granted, we may recognize excellent workmanship in the Silvius and Phebe episode. To have garbed Rosalind as a boy without making a girl fall in love with him would have been to miss a plain oppor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tunity—almost as plain a one as the sight of the bloody cloth at which Rosalind faints. It doubles the intrigue, and it provides with due irony one of the most charming chiming quartets in all Comedy:

Phebe. Good shepherd, tell this youth what 'tis to love.
Silvius. It is to be all made of sighs and tears;
And so am I for Phebe.
Phebe. And I for Ganymede.
Orlando. And I for Rosalind.
Rosalind. And I for no woman.

and so on, and so on. The *genre* and the convention of it granted, nothing could be prettier than the inter-chime and the counter-chime. It is Lyly carried to a power that Lyly never, at best, got beyond dreaming of.

But, having said this in praise of a piece of good workmanship, I must in fairness mention a piece of sheer botch-work. I mean the introduction of Hymen in the last Act. To explain away this botch as an imposition upon Shakespeare by another hand—to conjecture it as some hasty alternative to satisfy the public censor, who objected to Church rites of marriage on the stage (if carried through)—would be as easy as it were accordant with the nice distinctions of critical hypocrisy, were it not that Shakespeare, almost if not quite to the end of his days, was capable of similar ineptitudes, such as the vision of Posthumus and the scroll dropped into his lap. You can explain away one such lapse by an accident; but two scarcely, and three or four not at all. That kind of artistic improbability runs almost in harmonical progression.

ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BOOK OF THE MONTH

THE CASE OF PATIENCE WORTH[1]

BY LAWRENCE GILMAN

It was, we believe, that elaborately dissembling humorist, Professor Royce, who defined sin as "a viciously acquired naïveté." We have never felt sure that we thoroughly understood this definition, but if we *do* understand it, we refuse (with undiminished respect for the admirable sage of Cambridge) to accept it. Now that is precisely the attitude in which you are left by the average account of spiritualistic communications: you are uncertain of understanding them, but if you *do* understand them, you refuse to accept them. We all remember, for example, what the spiritualistic wireless offered us as an emanation of the supermundane intellect of William James, in which state of discarnate deshabille it seems to possess about the degree of depth and vigor that you would look for in the post-mortem cerebrations of a sentimental floor-walker; and we voice the general indisposition in this matter in the face of the devastating assertion of a distinguished authority on the occult that "any man who does not accept the existence of discarnate spirits and the proof of it is either an ignoramus or a coward." But let us hasten to say, in order that we may demonstrate our disqualification for inclusion in either of those unattractive categories, that we believe in the fact, if not in the proof.

One may convict Emerson of excessive generosity for asserting that "the people . . . are all mystics"; yet we are convinced that essential mystics, if not ubiquitous, are at least as common as professional Christians, or amateur

[1] *Patience Worth: A Psychic Mystery.* By Caspar S. Yost. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1916.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

polygamists, or hay-fever in August. There is, however, small doubt of the reaction that would be set up in an enormous number of people by any casual description of *Patience Worth.* Here—stated summarily—is an account of an experience in which a certain apparently discarnate personality imparted to a woman of St. Louis (an amateur dabbler in the psychic, of unimpeachable integrity) a mass of communications transmitted through the ouija-board, consisting of poems, allegories, conversations, epigrams, apothegms, novels, short plays, and a long mediaeval drama, all of them couched in archaic English, and exhibiting uncommon intellectual and literary quality. It is not necessary to make excuses for those who, reading such a description, would doubtless exclaim derisively, with Celia in *As You Like It,* "O wonderful, wonderful, and most wonderful wonderful! and yet again wonderful, and after that, out of all whooping!" and return unmoved to their perusal of the war news or THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. Yet if this derisive multitude should turn back a few years among the files of this very REVIEW they would find Prof. Münsterberg calmly remarking (as if he believed, like the psychical researcher we quoted above, that none but "fools or ignoramuses" deny the existence of discarnate spirits)—they would find him calmly remarking, we say, that "the soul cannot be dependent upon the days and the hours of the physical body . . . the soul is neither in the time nor in the space of the physical molecules." And if, thus beguiled, they should adventure further, and should read *Patience Worth,* we promise them that they would still be impelled to quote the words of Celia, but with a very different intonation: for if there is not here an authentic glimpse of "the soul's reaches, and the last limit of life," how, then, shall you solve this riddle?

That it is indeed a riddle which is posed by *Patience Worth*—a veritable "psychic mystery" (in the phrase of the book's sub-title)—is not open to question. Here is a case for which (as the discerning and studious observer must ultimately conclude) neither "the subconscious mind," that glib resort of the amateur psychologist, nor "telepathy," that amiable, sturdy, and most serviceable pack-horse of the near-materialist, provides a satisfying explanation. You will probably pin your faith to telepathy as a workable hypothesis; but it hardly serves—that is to say, if

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by " telepathy " you understand, as you doubtless do, the influence of a carnate mind exerted upon another carnate mind through supernormal avenues of communication. Confronted by Patience, even the apostles of the mechanistic view of life might turn a furtively enquiring glance toward the view of Dr. James H. Hyslop, that there is such a thing as a *discarnate* mind, and that it may exercise an influence, " either sensory or motor, on the minds of the living, provided they are psychically receptive to such influences."

It was on a July evening in 1913 that Patience Worth first made herself known. Two women of St. Louis sat with a ouija-board upon their knees: Mrs. Emily Grant Hutchings, wife of the Secretary of the Tower Grove Park Board of that city, and Mrs. John H. Curran, wife of a former Immigration Commissioner of Missouri. Mr. Casper S. Yost (editorial director of the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*), the admirable compiler of and commentator upon the Patience Worth communications, describes these participants in this singular drama of the occult: Both are " ladies of culture and refinement." Mrs. Hutchings is " a professional writer of skill "; but it was her companion, Mrs. Curran, who was the sole agent of transmission: for the communications came only when she was at the board, and it mattered not who else sat with her. Mrs. Curran is " a young woman of nervous temperament, bright, vivacious, ready of speech "; she is " intelligent, conscientious, a talented musician, a charming hostess, a member of the Episcopal Church "—clearly, as Mr. Yost observes, " there seems nothing abnormal about her." Be it further noted and remembered—for these facts are highly significant—that Mrs. Curran has never been in England, and has had no particular interest in English history, English literature, or English life; that she has never been a student of literature, ancient or modern, and has never attempted any form of literary work. So much for the minor characters. Enter, now, Patience Worth.

Mrs. Curran and Mrs. Hutchings had been laboriously spelling out on the board, with little more than " amused wonder," such messages " as might have come from the subconsciousness of either one or the other "—messages that were " no more strange than innumerable communications which have been received through the reading of the ouija-board." But " suddenly the pointer became endowed with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an unusual agility, and with great rapidity presented this introduction: *'Many moons ago I lived. Again I come. Patience Worth my name.'*"

Thereupon began a series of communications from the source thus announced that, according to the view of Mr. Yost, are "virtually without precedent, in the scant imaginative literature quoted in the chronicles of psychic phenomena," for "intellectual vigor and literary quality."

The records of these communications have accumulated until they now fill several volumes of typewritten pages. During the first month, only Mrs. Curran and Mrs. Hutchings sat at the board; but gradually the circle widened, and others assisted the original recipients. Sometimes as many as five or six took part in the course of an evening. Mrs. Curran's husband has acted as amanuensis for the communications, occasionally assisted by his mother-in-law. Mrs. Curran does not go into a trance when the communications are received (which indeed would be an unusual procedure in connection with ouija-board séances). On the contrary, her mind is "absolutely normal,"—she even talks to others while the board is in operation under her hands. There is no effort at mental concentration. Aside from Mrs. Curran, it does not matter who is present, or who sits at the board with her. "There is no ceremony about the sitting, no dimmed lights, no compelled silences, no mummeries of any sort. . . . The board is brought into the living-room under the full glare of the electric lamps. The men perhaps smoke their cigars. . . ." That the "reputation and social position" of the Currans "put them above the suspicion of fraud, if fraud were at all possible in such a matter as this," is an assertion of Mr. Yost's that no one, we fancy, will feel inclined to dispute—in fact, the transparent and palpable genuineness of the entire case, in all its aspects, is the chief impression you bear away with you from an unbiased study of it. You do not need Mr. Yost's assurance that Mrs. Curran gives no public exhibitions, nor private exhibitions for pay. The affair conveys the characteristic and unmistakable tone of the contemporary American mind in its reaction to profundities: the tone of jocose irreverence, tempered by an ineradicable sentimentalism, and conditioned by what Matthew Arnold once called an "incapacity for seriousness in the highest sense." The whole thing is patently honest in intention, reassuringly mat-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ter-of-fact in its processes, and utterly baffling and inexplicable in its meaning.

The communications received from Patience Worth occupy the greater part of two hundred pages in the published volume compiled by Mr. Yost. He makes no excessive claim when he affirms that the outstanding characteristic of these communications is their marked intellectual quality. The intelligence displayed in them is truly, as he says, "keen, swift, subtle and profound"—you will hunt fruitlessly for the abysmal and disheartening triviality, inanity, and inconsequence that have become the traditional mark of spiritistic communications. There is at work here a mind, whosever it may be, that has retained abundant vigor, distinction, and individual savor. Its medium is an archaic speech whose prevailing characteristics seem to be those of seventeenth-century English, but containing elements of a usage still older, and occasionally employing words and phrases that are strange to the English of any period, and to any known English dialect. Most of the words are of Anglo-Saxon origin, with scarcely ever any of Greek or Latin derivation. The references are almost without exception to conditions that came into being not later than the seventeenth century. That Patience emanates in any sense or degree from the consciousness or subconsciousness of Mrs. Curran is unbelievable in the light of Mr. Yost's description of that lady; but as to her identity, she blandly leaves you in the dark. She makes no effort to prove it; " she never speaks of her own acts as a physical being, and the personal information she has reluctantly given is disappointingly meagre "; yet " the impression of a distinct personality is clear and definite." She has said that she comes " from across the sea," and has indicated her period as about " 1649." All that can be deduced about her is that she seems to belong to the England of some 300 years ago; that she is indubitably feminine; expertly domestic and housewifely; an incurable aphorist; quick-tempered, caustic, witty, nimble of thought and speech; yet reflective, inclined to reverie and tenderness, sensitive and emotional, confessing aspiration, prone to meditate upon the things of the spirit, conscious of " immortal longings." Beyond dispute, a remarkable mind and personality, whatever its habitation or its day. Mrs. Curran, privileged to be the channel for its exhibition, might well have echoed gratefully the conclusion of Stevenson:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The most beautiful adventures are not those we go to seek."

As to the literary value of the communications, we are unable to go quite all the way with Mr. Yost, who is willing to say of certain images and figures in the verse of Patience that "a Shelley would not wish to disown them." To invoke one of the supreme names of poetry in connection with such phrases as "the tendrill tipped with sungilt" and "the sunny morn doth hum with lovelilt" is likely to disaffect the uninitiated reader who is prepared to regard Patience and her manifestations with sympathy and respect. You are reminded of the plaintive protest of Walter Pater, who wished people would not call him a "hedonist," because "it makes such a bad impression upon the minds of people who don't know Greek." Nor do the passages chosen for this praise, and others that receive encomiums almost equally warm, seem to us to represent Patience at her best. We prefer these lines from the play called *The Fool and the Lady:*

. . Her face, Beppo, it swayeth everywhere, as a garden thick with bloom—a lily, white and glistening with a rain of tears.

Elsewhere she is not so happy. There is a lurking sentimentalist in Patience, as you will discover from her versified references to "dimpled hands" and "the smile of baby lips." And we regret to learn that Mrs. Curran was moved to tears by the not very expensive pathos of the poem beginning "Ah, wake me not!" while there is no mention in the record of her having been affected by the much costlier emotion of

Earth! Earth, the mother of us all! . . . How loth, how loth, like to a child we be, to leave and seek mid dark!

There are other times—and they are many—when Patience is exasperatingly obscure and cryptic. Were it not for the patient and tireless exegetical skill of Mr. Yost, the reader would be unlikely to read further after encountering such an appalling *cheval-de-frise* as this:

. . And thee knowest 'tis not the put o' her; aye, and thee knowest 'tis ne'er a putter o' thy day there be at such an put. Aye, and did he to put, 'twould be o' thy day and not the day o' we.

Patience is not here discussing a seventeenth-century golf match, as the uninstructed reader might possibly conjecture; what she *is* discussing, we must refer you to the devoted and ingenious Mr. Yost to find out.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Naturally you will ask, upon laying down this amazing volume: What does it mean?—or, in Mr. Yost's words, "What, then, is her message?" A portion of his answer seems to us to contain all of it that is significant: "Whatever we may think of the nature of this phenomenon," he says, "Patience herself is a revelation." She is indeed; and that is enough. As to any detailed information concerning those mysteries which mortal questionings have immemorially beaten against in vain, Patience seems but to echo the reply that is made to the Sacrificer's son in the story in the Katha Upanishad: "Ask me not of death, Nachiketas." Or at most she appears to be repeating to us the grave words of her possible contemporary, Sir Thomas Browne: "This visible world is but a picture of the invisible, wherein, as in a portrait, things are not truly but in equivocal shapes, and as they counterfeit some more real substance in that invisible fabric"—and Sir Thomas himself was merely, of course, re-uttering the message of the Smaragdine Table. Mr. Yost interprets the sayings of Patience as in the highest degree consoling and promiseful. She gives us plainly to understand, he thinks, that personality persists beyond the grave; that we take with us "all of ourselves but the material elements"; that "we wake there amid the friends and associations of the past"; that "the joys of the coming life are the spiritual joys of this one." And, in response to the question whether there will be sorrow in that other life, he quotes her as giving this remarkable answer—remarkable, because it suggests that Patience may have read the Sanskrit tongue of Shankara the Master: "Nay," she answered, "Earth be a home of sorrow's dream. For sorrow be but a dream of the soul asleep. 'Tis wake [death] that setteth free." What is this but a variation of Shankara's words: "The circling world is like a dream, crowded with desires and hates; in its own time it shines as real, like the silver of a pearl shell, but on wakening it becomes unreal."

Let us leave her there, echoing the luminous teaching of the East,—speaking, indeed, out of its very heart: for it is also in those ancient and inexhaustible and golden Books of Wisdom that it is written: "Knowing that knowable spirit, let not death disturb you."

LAWRENCE GILMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED

AMERICA'S FOREIGN RELATIONS. In two volumes. By Willis Fletcher Johnson. New York: The Century Company, 1916.

Ordinary prudence recognizes the value of an occasional backward look for the purpose of discerning direction and determining proportions. The study of history, with its long perspective, helps in a much larger way to regulate thought and to guide action —tending to make the evolution of society ever more intelligent and consistent. What is true of history in general, is rather especially true as regards the history of a nation's dealings with other nations. And there is perhaps no kind of thinking in which the average, educated American citizen has greater need of the correcting and proportioning influence of historic knowledge than in his efforts to make up his mind about the place and destiny of America in the world. Of all important nations, declares Willis Fletcher Johnson in the preface of his recently published work, *America's Foreign Relations,* we are "probably the most self-centered and circumscribed." A certain narrowness of view, allied with "an excess of adulatory introspection" and with a self-complacency "sometimes smug and sometimes hifalutin," have been the cause of many of our domestic and most of our external ills.

We are wise to have faith in reason rather than in doctrines, in experience rather than in expedients. It is a sane hope that Mr. Johnson expresses in his preface—the hope that better knowledge may result in the amelioration of international sentiments, in the moderation both of excessive attachments and of excessive animosities; that it may "unify the sympathies, the policies, and the action of all domestic parties toward the external world," and, above all, that it may "invest our popular attitude toward other peoples and their governments with a dignity and benignity worthy of a nation that is well proportioned and judicious in all its greatness."

In helping to bring about these desirable ends, Mr. Johnson's book should be of great use. It is written as simply as the nature of the subject matter permits. It is free from the forbidding jargon of diplomacy; it contains no pompous and mystifying generalizations. The book is popular, but it is thorough. In it, sound, uncontroversial discussion is joined with full information. This last is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not the least of its virtues. Experience speaks louder than theory, and the value of detailed truth-telling as a guide and corrective to practical judgment is approved where formulas fail.

In treating of the "prenatal influences" which affected the nation, Mr. Johnson aids his readers in obtaining a larger view of early American history—supplying in fuller measure and in more intelligible form than do most historians that European setting which is indispensable to an understanding of the period. Equally instructive is his account of the international relationships of the United States during the revolutionary era—a period in which the international influence of this country was far more important than its technical diplomacy. The narrative shows, among other things, how America helped to bring about the end of personal government in Great Britain and how it effected for a time the commercial emancipation of Ireland. It reveals clearly the motives of France and of Spain in their attitude toward America.

In the ensuing period American problems took form, and the reader of Mr. Johnson's book is enabled to see the beginnings of American policies and tendencies. In treating of America under the Confederation, the author lays special stress upon three results that were achieved in the sphere of foreign relations—the adoption in Franklin's treaty with Prussia of a high and advanced principle of neutrality in naval warfare, the "scandalous spoliation, persecution, and expulsion of suspected British sympathizers, which led to the estrangement of Canada, and finally the setting-up of State rights as superior to treaty obligations." It is not, however, until the close of Washington's second Administration that American principles became clearly outlined. By this time the great foundation stones of our foreign policy had been laid: independence, neutrality, freedom of the seas, complete separation from European politics, and the dominance of the United States on the North American Continent. Through a judicious and undogmatic emphasis upon these principles Mr. Johnson makes his treatise enlightening as well as informing. His point of view is indicated by the statement that in more than a century of foreign relationships there is to be found "scarcely a new principle, but merely a further working out of the principles of Washington's Administration."

Through the crisis of national life, the completion of nationality, the War of 1812, the new era that began with Monroe, the author traces the development of the United States to world-power status, fully discussing many matters insufficiently emphasized by most historians. The account of the next period, which includes the Mexican War, the acquisition of Oregon, our Isthmian relations, our early dealings with the East, and the opening of Japan, becomes more and more a delineation of our country as we know it—a delineation that vitally connects the present with this earlier time and makes us feel the national character in a new way.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even more satisfactory is Mr. Johnson's treatment of the modern era, which, beginning with the Civil War, includes many problems still thought of as political issues. In dealing with the embroilment at Samoa, the annexation of Hawaii, our relations with Latin America, the war with Spain, the " open door " in China, the Isthmian Canal, the author speaks as plainly and fully as in any part of his treatise, expressing without hesitation the lessons which facts and logic teach. Yet, throughout, he writes with admirable impartiality, making no attempt to enforce peculiar views and never forgetting his primary duty as a historian.

As a whole, Mr. Johnson's book shows in perspective the relation of America to the rest of the world, marking out essential truths and permanent American policies. At the beginning and at the end of the treatise the fundamental ideas of Washington are emphasized, and this emphasis is justified by all the recorded facts. The work is " popular " not merely in the sense that it is easy to understand: it will help to make better citizens.

WILLIAM WORDSWORTH: HIS LIFE, WORKS, AND INFLUENCE. In two volumes. By George McLean Harper. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.

Wordsworth has taught his successors much: his mode of thought, the more seizable elements of his style, have become in a way common property; but we may still say, with Coleridge, that " in imaginative power, he stands nearest of all modern writers to Shakespeare and Milton; and yet in a kind perfectly unborrowed and his own."

What seems the flash of inspiration in poetry is frequently the sudden outcome and summing-up of experiences long matured, of feelings cherished in quiet, and of thoughts deeply meditated. A poem, to be sure, is not chiefly a problem for psychologic analysis; but if it is, as it should be, a genuine expression of personal life raised to the impersonal plane, it gains in significance through a study of the mental conditions out of which it grew. This is particularly true of Wordsworth: few poets sum up so much genuine inner experience in a little space; few are so profound while seeming simple. In an exceptional degree the study of Wordsworth's life helps one to understand not merely the mind and the character of the man, but the meaning and worth of the poet.

Moreover, it is true that despite his acknowledged greatness, no poet suffers more than Wordsworth from a conventional or superficial view. The gossipers of his own time, the Scotch reviewers, and finally, perhaps, Wordsworth himself, have impressed upon our minds an image august, indeed, yet a trifle absurd, and hence not wholly lifelike. The Wordsworth of the last period, the moralist,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the theologian, the "non-Wordsworthian Wordsworth," has worked injustice to the poet as he was in his prime.

It is one of the merits of George McLean Harper's recently published life of Wordsworth that it really gives one an adequate appreciation of the poet not merely as a nature-mad boy nor as an elderly philosopher, but as an inspired youth and as a young man of genius. The conception of Wordsworth at his best is the norm of the narrative, and it is never lost sight of. With sympathy and with painstaking care, Professor Harper traces the development of Wordsworth's intellect and soul, estimating the effect upon him of such influences as the thought of Rousseau, the criticism of Coleridge, the growth of industrialism in England, and especially the ideas and scenes of the French Revolution. In this process, the author shows not merely psychological insight but an unusual degree of biographical acumen. The view, for instance, that in 1796 Wordsworth at Racedown was passing through a crisis, that he was under a spiritual cloud, is proved to be quite without foundation. The notion, too, that Wordsworth and Coleridge on their return in 1799 from their visit to the Continent were quite cured of democratic tendencies, is likewise subjected to criticism. Professor Harper is the first to lay due emphasis upon the true reason which caused Wordsworth to put aside the *Prelude* in 1802—the unsettled state of his political opinions. The real crisis of the poet's life, which occurred between 1803 and 1807, the author discusses in a manner that is really illuminating. He shows us Wordsworth, in the *Prelude*, "reacting against the great positive, naturalistic movement of the preceding century—breaking with his own past, abandoning his own faith." He points out, however, that, as the letter to Christopher North published during 1809 in *The Friend* abundantly proves, the disintegration had not at that time reached Wordsworth's central doctrines. The narrowing of the poet's outlook in later years, the failure of inspiration, and the mistaken withdrawal from the world—the sad deterioration, in short, that seems more perverse than inevitable—is dealt with clearly and frankly. The general effect of the narrative as a whole, however, is to emphasize the unity, the consistency, the integrity, of Wordsworth's life.

The life-story, too, is successfully set against an adequate human background. Wordsworth's social relationships are made real to the reader. Coleridge, for example, appears as a far more credible human figure than most biographical sketches show him. Even more remarkable is the keen sympathy and insight that are manifest in all that Professor Harper tells about Dorothy Wordsworth, whose journal, of course, supplies much of the most valuable biographical material.

In critical appreciation, Professor Harper's book is as penetrating as it is authoritative. To say nothing of its value to scholarship, the book will enable every reader who is capable of feeling Words-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worth's power and charm to read his poetry with a fuller understanding and a deeper feeling.

MODERNIZING THE MONROE DOCTRINE. By Charles H. Sherrill. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1916.

That the Monroe Doctrine is a policy by no means free from doubts and difficulties is pretty generally agreed. The doctrine is notoriously hard to define; it has meant different things at different times; it is regarded with qualified respect in Europe and with marked suspicion in South America. As it is sometimes made to appear, this time-honored policy of ours is to Europe little more than foolishness and to Latin America a formidable stumbling block. From time to time we have "modernized" the Monroe Doctrine, more or less: the view is now being pressed with considerable urgency that we ought to modernize it altogether.

"Modernizing the Monroe Doctrine" would mean, in the view of Mr. Charles H. Sherrill, substituting for it the doctrine of Pan-Americanism. In what is written about this latter policy—and rather especially in what Mr. Sherrill writes about it—there are certain obvious elements of truth. Pan-Americanism Mr. Sherrill defines as "an attempt to assemble the finest traits of twenty-one republics so as to employ them in combination for the common good of all, meanwhile disregarding their shortcomings." It is a mixture of appreciation and toleration, a combination of altruism and enlightened self-interest. In its general features the policy is attractive; as a mental attitude it is commendable. Readers of Mr. Sherrill's chapters upon South American culture and South American markets will almost certainly be interested and impressed. Nor will most readers be inclined to quarrel seriously with the author's opinion that the "A. B. C." mediation was a success in the sense that it established a "High Court of Public Opinion for the Western Hemisphere."

It seems clear that what is said in favor of Pan-Americanism is perfectly true up to a certain point. One may even agree with Mr. Sherrill that while "some policies are only beneficial when completely worked out. Pan-Americanism even when incomplete is beneficial." An incomplete Pan-Americanism, however, would seem to include much that might be safely accepted without adopting the Pan-American label or explicitly renouncing the Monroe Doctrine. A completely worked out Pan-Americanism implies, of course, a definite foreign policy; and it is at just the point where a definite line of action in foreign relationships begins to be called for that the new doctrine becomes a little hard to follow. There are varying versions of Pan-Americanism as a foreign policy. Mr. Sherrill's version has at least the merits of clearness and courage.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The author's program includes two sets of recommendations, none too closely connected. The first set has special reference to the building up of American foreign trade. Laws should be enacted, Mr. Sherrill urges, modifying the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit railroads to grant preferential rates on goods to the seaboard intended for export, and so amending the Sherman Act that it shall be lawful to make combinations for trade outside our borders. The nation, moreover, should take immediate steps to free itself from the meshes of those treaties which are "strangling" the merchant marine. The second set of suggestions looks toward the establishment of permanent peace in the two Americas. Taking advantage of the present financial dependence of European countries upon the United States, we are to ask these countries "to release to the sovereignty of the peoples themselves all colonial territory owned by them in the Western Hemisphere." Canada, it is explained, "can have her independence whenever she likes," and hence her status as part of the British Empire need not greatly concern us. Other American territories belonging to European nations are to be bought or begged. Then by means of financial pressure and by persuasion partly moral and partly pecuniary, America is to be safeguarded from friction with Europe. The released territories may be apportioned in such a way as would best serve to strengthen Latin America. The gift of the three Guianas might, in Mr. Sherrill's opinion, be made to further "the statesmanlike project of Bolivar . . . a splendid confederation of the Guianas with Venezuela, Colombia and Ecuador." Peace with Asia is to be assured by the complete detachment of the United States from every supposed Asiatic interest. The "open door" policy is to be frankly abandoned, and the Philippines are to be given up. Thus Mr. Sherrill's "triangle of peace" is completed.

In this book there is real knowledge, idealism, vigorous, suggestive thought. As a discussion of the foreign policy of the United States, the treatise, however, is too slight to be convincing. On the whole, the author fails to give such a definition of Pan-Americanism as will satisfy skeptics that this policy is necessary, safe and practicable.

THE END OF A CHAPTER. By Shane Leslie. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.

Few books of seemingly desultory reminiscence and comment equal this of Mr. Shane Leslie's in a certain vitality of thought and pungency of expression. Apparently aiming at brilliancy and certainly attaining it, the author has packed his book with anecdotes really meaningful and choice in flavor, with shrewd criticisms, and with sayings arrestingly epigrammatic; and he has fastidiously omit-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ted whatever might seem to be padding or mere indulgence in the joy of writing. The note of it all is personal and genuine, and the underlying spirit of this unusually entertaining book is one of deep seriousness. "It was while invalided in hospital during the Great War," Mr. Leslie tells us in his prefatory note, "that I began to record notes and souvenirs of the times and institutions under which I had lived, realizing that I had witnessed the suicide of the civilization called Christian and the travail of a new era to which no gods have been as yet rash enough to give their name." Not the lurid glare of battle, but a faint, disastrous gleam from this new era lights the pages of Mr. Leslie's book.

The book begins with a chapter of "links with the past"—reminiscences mostly drawn from the memory of Mr. Leslie's grandfather, who "while a Harrow boy subscribed to the first shilling parts of the *Pickwick Papers*," and can remember five reigns. Personal recollections of Walter Scott, the youthful Ruskin, Newman, Napoleon III, D'Orsay—the last of the Dandies—and many other notables, are included in the narrative. Mr. Leslie's grandfather remembers the famous prize fight between Sayers and Heenan, "which roused more real feeling between England and America than the *Alabama*," and he was the last sportsman to use a muzzle-loader to shoot pheasants. An artist, he was the close friend of Holman Hunt and of Millais, and he may justly claim to be regarded as "the last of the pre-Raphaelites."

In its succeeding chapters, Mr. Leslie's book becomes a short anatomy of English society, a cursory analysis of Church and State, of universities and schools, of politics and politicians, of sport and imperialism and freedom. Somewhat apart stands an illuminating chapter upon "Ireland and the Irish." Dealing with these topics in the untrammeled manner of good talk, the author tells as much perhaps about national traits and conditions as could a writer of greater philosophic pretensions.

Good talk, of course, is not argument; its value often lies simply in its stimulating epitomes of views and impressions. Somehow Mr. Leslie manages to be unreverent without being flippant, to be unsparingly critical yet never sadly satirical. Without giving serious ground for offense he can write that King Edward was "a go-between rather than a statesman, a conversationalist rather than a man of letters, but . . . the only diplomat in the public service"; that "George V may rouse his subjects' mirth, but he is their best figurehead sailing through the waters of Armageddon"; that "the Church of England reigns chiefly as a social club, with which are deposited the moral standards of society"; that "an appreciation of sportsmanship is the test for autonomy through the Empire." It would be a mistake to read Mr. Leslie's book unhumorously, a greater mistake not to perceive its essential earnestness.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"VOX POPULI!"

NEW ENGLAND

CHARLES HOPKINS CLARK

(*From the Hartford Courant*)

In the significant phrase, "Nobody for Hughes—but the people," George Harvey announces his survey of present conditions in the field of Republican politics, in the May number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. Mr. Harvey's previous editorial essays have been so brilliant, trenchant, and stirring, as to awaken eager interest in them and eager anticipation of those to follow. In this article he seems to us to have surpassed all former efforts. For brilliancy, incisiveness, cogency, humor, vividness and force it is distinguished above any political polemic of recent years that we recall.

The grim remark of a Wisconsin Congressman is quoted to the effect that it would be easier to "stand by the President" if the President himself would only stand still; but Mr. Harvey's article, so far as the President is concerned, is chiefly remarkable for the eloquent severity with which it lets him alone! Ephraim seems joined to his idols! Two months ago THE NORTH AMERICAN was suggesting promising Republican combinations, Root for President and Roosevelt for Secretary of State, or *vice versa*. But things have changed since then, and Mr. Harvey sees that Root and Roosevelt are not the only remarkable figures in sight. He considers and does ample justice to Mr. Root, "the greatest living American statesman," but doubts that the people want him for President; and all through his paper Mr. Harvey sounds that note—What or whom do the people want? Mr. Roosevelt is next considered, at length, seriously and humorously. His attitude, his interviews, his backwardness and forwardness, his stern warnings and intimations that "Barkis is willing" in heroic conditions, his —well, the whole recent history of Mr. Roosevelt is spread out in the light:—

"History does not record a political act so fully laden with audacity and presumption as that of a statesman, however heroic, who in one breath defiantly heralds his allegiance to a party which has become a remnant, and in the next arrogantly defines the terms upon which he will accept a nomination from the party which he assassinated. It was not the Prodigal son who possessed the fatted calf."

The conclusion concerning Mr. Roosevelt is that, although some months ago there was a possibility of his nomination by the Republican Party, things have so changed since as to eliminate that possibility. What then? Hughes? Mr. Harvey gives an amusing list of the persons who, he says, do not want Mr. Hughes, and concludes, "Nobody wants Hughes," and then,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in italics, "Nobody but the people!" To the question, why that is so, Mr. Harvey devotes his attention.

He considers various objections, and first that based on the fact that Mr. Hughes is a Justice of the Supreme Court, and, as such, should not be nominated for President. He brings up what he says is the voice of the people in answer to that objection. Again, it is said: "It is not known what Mr. Hughes stands for"; and again he refers to the people, and he does so with great plainness and power; whether correctly and accurately, the reader must decide for himself. But it is done with amazing cleverness and force, and our editor's imaginary colloquy with the *New York World* is a masterpiece of dialectics. For instance, the *World* objects, "He cannot say whether he is for or against the President's foreign policies." To which Mr. Harvey answers, "He probably could not define them!"

Finally, Mr. Harvey undertakes to show that neither the politicians nor the people are in ignorance as to Mr. Hughes's political standing and opinions. His utterances are quoted, and his unquestioned ability, sincerity, and rectitude are remarked. He says the politicians fear him, the people trust him, and want him.

"Will he take it?" and Mr. Harvey reviews Mr. Hughes's political career. He has never directly sought or been an inferential candidate for office. That has been and still is his position; but Mr. Harvey expresses his full conviction that "this old-fashioned man holds firmly to the old-fashioned idea that the responsibilities of the Presidency are so great that it is not to be sought and must not be declined."

We have given only a faint indication of the trend, scope, and force of this brilliant paper, which cannot fail to exert an influence upon public sentiment, and which all who are interested in the politics of our country should read.

JAMES T. WILLIAMS, JR.

(*From the Boston Evening Transcript*)

Colonel George Harvey calls the turn on the Presidential situation in a single sentence. "Nobody wants Hughes—nobody but the people," is the conclusion he reaches in the current number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, to which he contributes a characteristically vigorous editorial survey on Presidential prospects as regards Republican candidates. As "the prophet of the Presidency" who put Princeton on the political map, and more than any other one man or one thousand men made Woodrow Wilson President of the United States, the judgment of Colonel Harvey on the eve of the national convention which will nominate the opponent of his former friend and protégé will everywhere arouse interest, everywhere command attention, and to the minds of many carry conviction.

His prediction that Mr. Hughes will be nominated at Chicago is in no sense fathered by the wish of the prophetic and philosophical Colonel, for his speculation in previous numbers of the REVIEW has covered a wide field. It is the conclusion forced upon an open mind by a succession of events, by the multiplication of the signs of the times, by straws which show the way the winds of popular preference are blowing. We commend the article in its entirety to the attention of every voter in search of a competent and dispassionate opinion and not averse to an entertaining half hour in the editorial companionship of the maker and the unmaker of the present occu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pant of the White House. Having expressed the opinion more than a month ago that the nomination of Mr. Hughes appeared almost as inevitable as the renomination of Mr. Wilson, the *Transcript* gladly records the sustaining opinion of Colonel Harvey to the same effect.

SOLOMON BULKLEY GRIFFIN

(*From the Springfield Republican*)

In the May number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, Colonel George Harvey surveys the present situation in the Republican party as regards Presidential candidates and, without having the light which the Massachusetts primary shows, reaches the conclusion that the man whom the rank and file of Republicans want is Justice Hughes. He believes that neither the man who assumes to lead what is left of the Progressive Party, nor men of the old guard like Barnes and Penrose, nor men of great financial interests like Judge Gary, Thomas F. Ryan and John D. Archbold, nor Nicholas Murray Butler, nor the Democrats, President Wilson included, desire Hughes. But when this investigator turns to the rank and file, whether in Hartford, Springfield or Peacham—the colonel's birthplace—or Pittsburgh or Columbus, or on the farms in Iowa, Oregon or Washington, he finds "none whose countenance fails to brighten at the mention of Hughes." It is a vivid depiction, to be sure, but who shall say that there is not a great measure of truth in what Colonel Harvey finds? In this particular instance he is not making a prediction so much as recording facts as he discovers them. There are plenty of men of light and leading of great prominence in the country who believe that in the nomination of Justice Hughes lies the best hope of the Republican Party, and all these, of course, belong among "the people."

ROBERT LINCOLN O'BRIEN

(*From the Boston Herald*)

There is no more interesting observer of political tendencies and conditions in this country than Colonel George Harvey, chiefly known to fame as the discoverer of Woodrow Wilson, but much longer known as an editor and essayist, whose specialty has been politics and whose vision and background alike command admiration. While he writes discursively in the paper which we present this morning, it is one of those free and easy rambles among the events of current interest which will repay the time and attention of thoughtful readers. His conclusions thus reached are well worth noting. That he started out with other views—that he thought a few years ago that Senator Borah, of Idaho, would be the Republican nominee, and as recently as the time of his address in Boston last winter, that Root or McCall would be the man—detracts nothing from the impressiveness of the conclusion which he now reaches.

(*From the Newburyport News*)

We have a number of booms for the Presidency now in process of the making in this country. Who is making them? Very few of them can be called absolutely spontaneous. The groups behind each can in general be fairly well discerned. Among them is a boom for Justice Hughes. Who wants Hughes?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Colonel George Harvey, in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW answers that question in this way: "Nobody wants Hughes—nobody but the people." He has called over the roll of the politicians of the country, and of the large business interests of the country, and one by one he has remarked that these do not want Hughes. Who then does want the Justice for President? "Nobody, that is, nobody but the people." It is a most interesting summary. Is it a true statement of the situation?

There are a great many reasons for thinking that it is. These reasons consist of expressions of public opinion which have occurred in various parts of the country and which have been called forth entirely apart from anything Mr. Hughes has or has not done in regard to the matter. There is hardly a state in which he has not his supporters and hardly a state in which there are not indications that he could run stronger than almost any other candidate if it were once known that he would consider the matter. The demand is entirely spontaneous. The people are looking for a man of character and of sound judgment and of experience in large affairs. They think they have found all in this man who first made such a name for himself in the insurance investigation, then as Governor of New York State, and who is now fulfilling well the duties of a Justice of the Supreme Court. It is not often that a man is drafted in this way, but this year the movement appears to be getting irresistible.

Nobody knows, of course, whether Justice Hughes would accept. Some think that he would not. Others are sure that he would if the demand arose from the people. It is more than possible that before long he may have to decide.

(*From the Pawtucket Times*)

Colonel George Harvey, who "discovered" Woodrow Wilson and later regretted his find, has now discovered the American people, and, analyzing them telepathically and from the angle of a student of men, he declares they want Hughes. Want him contumaciously, if not with any severe ratiocinative conviction. Just want him and they don't want the others. Colonel Harvey declares you see Hughes men in every walk of life, and you have but to ask them to ascertain the accuracy of his diagnosis.

The Colonel himself is for Hughes, knows it and knows why. His reasons are the people's which perhaps they do not know, and in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW he patiently explains his preference.

Dependability and common sense. These are the attributes that in Colonel Harvey's opinion, make Hughes the people's choice. A good enough reason, but Mr. Taft was also that sort of a man. Did the people dote on dependability and good judgment in 1912? Several millions of them were attracted by the surface brilliancy and theatrical skill of Colonel Roosevelt. Several millions were awed by the learned mien and stately epigrams and aphorisms of Mr. Wilson—his university glamor, his profound gravity and reflecting countenance. The majority, comparing dependability and common sense, as embodied in Mr. Taft, with the calcium flash of Colonel Roosevelt and the ponderous intellectuality of Mr. Wilson, calmly turned away from the qualities which, Colonel Harvey says, they count first of all. But what is a people that learns nothing from the blisters of brilliance and the suffocation of the academic presence? Perhaps George is right, and Americans now realize the value of a steady hand at the helm.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*From the Barre Times*)

Colonel Harvey's characterization of some of the leading possibilities for the next President of the United States is likely to be passed around the entire country because it seems to represent absolute sincerity of belief on top of keen judgment of men and their capabilities. Moreover, this comparison condenses in concise form a very general impression from one end of the continent to the other. It should be noted, however, that Colonel Harvey does not go as far as to say that Hughes will be the next President of the United States; he is not so flatfooted in statement as he was in the situation a long time before Woodrow Wilson was even a nominee for the high office.

(*From the Holyoke Transcript*)

It's a deuced clever slogan, but coming from Colonel Harvey one should take it *cum grano salis*. Isn't he a great friend of President Wilson? Put two and two together and you can easily detect a motive in this Hughes boom.

To the Editor of the *Boston Herald*:—Colonel Harvey's letter in the morning *Herald* is certainly a masterstroke, and the *Herald* is to be congratulated, not only for giving its readers one of the most interesting and witty stories of political facts ever published, but also for effectively reminding the people that since 1908 they have had it in their hearts to make Justice Hughes President of the United States. The fidelity and devotion of Justice Hughes to public duty may well be expressed in words of the Bard of Avon: "Constant as the Northern Star, of whose true-fix'd and resting quality, there is no fellow in the firmament." When the voice of the people shall speak through the convention hall at Chicago, Justice Hughes will heed the call.

L. M. CHURBUCK.

BROCKTON, April 27.

NEW YORK

JAMES GORDON BENNETT

(*From the New York Herald*)

Colonel George Harvey, editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, inspired with the essence of political intuition, in one leap has boarded the Hughes band wagon and with a motion of his good right arm has possessed himself of the padded stick belonging to the big bass drum. "Come along," he says; "this is the winning carry-all. There is nothing like it in all the world. The vehicle of the St. Louis Convention is a hearse. Nobody is for Hughes but the People!"

Nobody is for Hughes—but the people! It is an alluring slogan. Even Hughes isn't for Hughes. The office is pursuing him even as the long-eared hound chases the flying fox. He might be a popular candidate with the politicians if he had a few of the grievances which almost everybody else collected in 1912. But he is a pauper when the question of grievances or enmities is concerned. What right has any man to be considered for the nomination on the Republican ticket unless he ran on the third ticket in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1912 or took part in the theft, robbery, burglary, spoliation, embezzlement—never mind, any term will do—which was perpetrated in broad daylight in full view of the Coliseum stage four years ago? Why, Justice Hughes hasn't even the qualification of having been thrown out of a convention! He hasn't lectured for peace and he hasn't made stump speeches for war! He hasn't a battle axe or a publicity bureau!

It is true that there is a strong feeling for the nomination of Justice Hughes on the part of a very large number of citizens, but they are mere voters. What do they know about qualifications for the Presidency? Justice Hughes doesn't even know how to cater to a pro-Ally mass meeting or a pro-German *schuetzenfest*. Was there ever such an exasperating man?

We shall see what we shall see. If, as Colonel Harvey says, the people are united in the demand, Justice Hughes may run away fast as he can, but nothing can prevent his nomination and election.

* * *

Second only to his own is the nation's interest in the political prognostications of Colonel George Harvey. That past performances, as the racing "dopesters" put it, clearly entitle the editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW to a hearing none will gainsay. However, not even a Jersey prophet is infallible. Conceding that the psychology of the present seems to furnish Colonel Harvey with ample warrant for his diagnosis that it is "Nobody for Hughes—*but the people*," what assurance can there be that this will be the psychological situation in the middle of June?

See what has already happened. Hardly had the ink dried on Colonel Harvey's confident prediction of a Hughes victory before up bobbed Mr. James Devoy with his threats that Irish hyphenates will join the German hyphenates in fighting President Wilson. Of course, nobody takes these hyphenates very seriously, but if they do attempt to make good their threats there will be "nobody" in this country "for Wilson—but the people," and that without regard to party affiliations, past or present. Then what will become of Colonel Harvey as a prophet?

[We have not predicted the *election* of Mr. Hughes.—EDITOR.]

ROLLO OGDEN

(*From the New York Evening Post*)

We are sometimes afraid of Colonel Harvey when he mounts the tripod for oracular deliverances, but in this case he is not far wrong when he sums up the way in which political opinion is manifesting itself:

Ask the man in the street, on the sidewalk, in the car, on the subway, in the Pullman, on the jitney, in the vestibule, after service, on the golf links before or after, downtown or uptown, in or out of clubs not dominated by masters of finance, in Hartford, Springfield, or Peacham, in wealth-wallowing Pittsburgh even, or Columbus, or on the farms of Iowa, in Oregon, or Washington, anywhere and everywhere, up hill and down dale, in this broad land, ask yourself, your wife, your plethoric uncle, your spinster aunt—and what do you find?

Some who distrust the supporters of Root; many who are angry at Roosevelt; not a few, inclusive of Democrats, who are sick of Wilson; none whose countenance fails to brighten at the mention of Hughes.

Likelihoods are safer to go upon than sweeping predictions. Prophecy in politics has been rightly called a gratuitous blunder. It is not a case of asserting today what surely will be, but only what probably will be. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certain thing is that the Republicans have passed the turning-point, so far as the Roosevelt attack is concerned. And the signs point significantly to the conclusion that they will find their best man to rally behind in the person of Charles E. Hughes.

EDWARD P. MITCHELL

(*From the New York Sun*)

Our enterprising and intelligent contemporary the *Literary Digest* cannot be accused of that partisan bias which twists straws or shapes election inquiries so as to produce a predetermined result. It has been making a poll of Republican and Progressive preferences according to a method of its own. Taking the legislative district as a unit, the *Digest* has addressed its questions to the members of the Legislatures and has received from thirty-one States 1,500 replies or votes. With allowances here and there for the favorite son, nearly four-fifths of all the votes are divided among three worthies, in the following order as here exhibited:

Hughes	758
Roosevelt	275
Root	138

It is interesting to note that in only four of the thirty-one States, namely, Minnesota, New Mexico, Colorado and Wyoming, does Colonel Roosevelt's vote exceed that for Mr. Justice Hughes. A ratio of more than two to one is quite uniformly preserved throughout the list.

This exhibit will interest Colonel Harvey, even if it does not interest the eminent and detached candidate of Colonel Harvey and the people.

FRANK I. COBB

(*From The New York World*)

A lovely lyric poet is our friend Colonel George Harvey, with his eye in fine frenzy rolling, and seeing "none whose countenance fails to brighten at the mention of Hughes"; but what can he mean when he says *The World* does not want Hughes nominated? Certainly he never got such a notion from the editorial columns of *The World*.

The World twice supported Hughes for Governor, and there is no man in public life for whom we have higher respect. There are circumstances in which it would support Hughes for President, but those circumstances do not exist at this time, for we regard President Wilson as much better qualified for the office than Justice Hughes, and believe that the most patriotic thing the Republicans could do would be to indorse Wilson.

But if the Republican Party is determined in the midst of a world crisis to make a drive for the patronage and the jobs, we think that Justice Hughes would be the most respectable leader it could select for the raid.

Contrary to Colonel Harvey's ballad, *The World* is not trying to prevent his nomination. We have expressed the opinion that Hughes would not be nominated and that Roosevelt would cut his throat if he were. We still hold to that belief, but beyond that point our interest is that of an innocent bystander. And in spite of Colonel Harvey's song service, we can find little evidence that "the people" themselves want Hughes. If they did they would get him, and the Republican nomination would already be settled.

[We shall see.—EDITOR.]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*From the Brooklyn Eagle*)

So, to recapitulate, the Progressives are no longer dictatorial, there is hardly the ghost of a chance that Mr. Root will be nominated and the Roosevelt boom is no longer at high water mark. Colonel Harvey should be pleased. He has predicted that Charles E. Hughes will be the Republican nominee. The Progressives have through Mr. Perkins signified their willingness to fall in line, subject to the condition that Mr. Hughes express his approval of their principles, which, of course, he will not do. Nor will they insist. With the elimination of uncertainties, what seems to be a reasonable certainty materializes. This not to the detriment of Colonel Harvery's prestige as a prophet.

(*From the Plattsburg Press*)

An editorial by Colonel George Harvey, published in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, is attracting much attention. In it he predicts that Charles E. Hughes will be nominated for President by the Republican convention in Chicago. Yet he says, "nobody wants Hughes—nobody but the people."

That statement is not entirely true, however. That the people want him cannot be denied. "Never since this Republic demanded that George Washington become its first President has there appeared so striking an instance of the office seeking the man," says Colonel Harvey. "Never has there been a call so peremptory, never a constantly swelling force so certain, in our judgment, to prove irresistible." In this Colonel Harvey is correct. The demand for Hughes is strong and consistent on the part of the people. They want him.

But then also do some of the Republican politicians. Some of the wisest among them—those who put the interests of the country and of the Republican party above their own interests—favor the nomination of Hughes because they are convinced that not only would he surely be elected, but because they believe he would make an ideal President. They trust him as do the people.

The popular demand for Hughes makes him the logical candidate and the chances are ten to one that the Republican convention when it meets in Chicago will take due cognizance of this fact and that he will be nominated. That he will accept may also be accepted as a foregone conclusion. He cannot turn down the call of the people any more than George Washington could have done it. He must answer their call.

The popular faith in Hughes is a splendid tribute to his worth as a man. It is evident that the people trust him, that they regard him as honest and able, that they feel he is the man for the present emergency. They do not question his principles, his Americanism, his patriotism. Instinctively they feel that with him at the head of the national Government the country will be safe and its interests carefully protected, and they want nothing more. That explains the peremptoriness of the call for Hughes.

EVERYBODY SATISFIED

(*From the Syracuse Post-Standard*)

Colonel George Harvey feels sure that the people want the nomination of Justice Hughes to the Presidency; and he is with the people.

The Colonel holds opinions with respect to our duty in the war as heroic as the Colonel of Oyster Bay. He has gone beyond the Colonel in his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

condemnation of the pointless policy of the Administration in Mexico. He doesn't know what Justice Hughes' opinions are, for the Justice by his position is compelled to keep his opinions upon political questions to himself. Still as between the Colonel, whose position is well known, and the President, whose various and swiftly changing positions Colonel Harvey has carefully noted, he prefers the Justice.

The editor, who made Mr. Wilson President by sheer persistence of his pen, has explained fully his reasons for dissatisfaction with his job. As Mr. Wilson upon a famous and sorrowful occasion declared his conviction that Mr. Harvey's support was not to be desired, he has no reason for complaint over that dissatisfaction and the resulting praise for Hughes.

Tried and True

(*From the Watertown Times*)

Attention is called to Colonel George Harvey's editorial published in the current issue of The North American Review, and reprinted in *The Times* this afternoon. Colonel Harvey sees nothing but Hughes. He reads the letters across the sky from horizon to horizon, embracing the entire country. "Nobody wants Hughes—nobody but the people," is his statement.

Residents of states other than New York may now believe this is true through the statement of so many observers, but New Yorkers, those who have followed the political fortunes of the State since 1906, know it is true. It was the people of the State who wanted Hughes back in the "Hughes days," and it was the politician that did not want him, and the people won out against heaviest organized odds. Their judgment as to the desirability of having him was fully realized. The demand is as insistent and country-wide today as it was insistent and state-wide when New York made Hughes Governor. He will yield now as he did then, and he will make the kind of President that he made Governor.

Colonel Harvey approaches the subject with an open mind. It was he who picked Wilson and predicted that he would be named. How disappointed he was, one only has to read The North American Review for the past few years to ascertain. But it was he who, in *Harper's Weekly*, literally wrote the Princetonian into public favor, only to have the same Princetonian turn away from him when place was attained and expediency demanded it, even as he has turned from many of his own principles and doctrines because expediency has demanded it. Colonel Harvey has written in an unbiased way from time to time of the Presidential possibilities during the past few months. His experienced judgment now causes him to narrow down to Hughes. And why? Because "Nobody wants Hughes—nobody but the people."

(*From the Utica Press*)

In commenting upon Justice Hughes and the probability of his Presidential nomination, Colonel Harvey in The North American Review says, "Nobody is for Hughes—but the people." When you come to think of it that is about the best thing which could be said of anybody in this connection. It is undoubtedly true that he is not especially popular with the politicians because they cannot manage him. They tried that when he was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Governor of New York, and did not succeed. Probably that is one of the principal reasons of his strength. He has not been out delivering lectures or talks to the people telling them what they should do about preparedness, or anything else. He has simply been attending to his business, which is decidedly important, and engrosses his entire time and attention. He has done nothing to bring himself into the limelight, and though he is there very considerably and notably, it was accomplished without any hint, suggestion or assistance on his part.

Behind all the others mentioned is some particular clique or coterie, some Old Guard or Young Guard, or else a state through the favorite son route. Even Henry Ford has paid an exceedingly big price for his prominence as an advocate of peace. His expedition cost a pretty penny, and perhaps was worth the investment as advertising. Not even a company of personal friends and admirers came out for Hughes to do any definite organized or systematic work in his behalf. The only fact which makes him a Presidential possibility is a very widely entertained idea that he is the strongest man, and would get more votes than anybody else whose name has been proposed. He has not even said he would accept if nominated, but still the people keep right on talking about him. Most of the delegates at the Chicago convention are unpledged, and are in a situation where they can be governed and guided as much as they will by the wish of their constituents whom they represent. It follows, then, that if the people have any choice about it which they care to express it will be timely and in order for them to tell the delegates from their several districts what they think. If the consensus of opinion in various sections of the country is a decided trend in any one direction, it can be safely said and set down that the man thus selected is the one who will have the largest support.

(*From the Buffalo Commercial*)

Hughes sentiment in the Republican Party is growing and if it continues to grow for the next five weeks as it has in the last five the Chicago convention will nominate the New Yorker for President without question—providing, of course, that he does not absolutely decline to permit his name to be considered. So far as this contingency is concerned, while nothing more has been heard from Mr. Hughes respecting it, the fact that he is not saying a word to discourage the movement, now fast gaining momentum, to make him the standard bearer, lends confidence to the belief that he will take the nomination under the conditions likely to prevail in the convention when it is made.

One of the latest recruits to the Hughes cause is Colonel George Harvey, editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. The Colonel sums up the situation in a nutshell when he says that "nobody wants Hughes but the people."

The New York *Evening Post*, Independent Democrat, says that it would be foolish "not to note the spreading belief that the man who has the best chance of being elected if nominated is Hughes." The drift is everywhere observable and every test one can make reveals it.

Favorite sons show no strength outside of their native states, and when they are eliminated from the race their strength will largely go to Mr. Hughes, the man whose Republicanism and whose Americanism is not a subject of debate within his party.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*From the Rochester Democrat-Chronicle*)

Colonel Harvey is at his best in his article on Hughes in the May number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, and when at his best he is extremely entertaining, as all are aware who were in the habit of reading his comments on political affairs when he was editor of *Harper's Weekly*. Justice Hughes has been discussed at considerable length by political writers, but Colonel Harvey has aroused more interest in his possible candidacy than all the others combined. With Justice Hughes as his text, he has written a brilliant political essay, remarkable for its sparkling wit as well as for its trenchancy and force.

It is well known that he did more than any one man to make Mr. Wilson a national figure. Political expediency led Mr. Wilson to repudiate his support, but that did not cancel the obligation Mr. Wilson was under for assistance at a time when Democratic politicians, as a rule, looked on him very coldly. He will not be under any embarrassment this year by reason of Colonel Harvey's support. Colonel Harvey has been thoroughly disillusioned, and does not take any pains to conceal his feelings. He begins his remarks by expressing sympathy with Representative Cooper, of Wisconsin, when the latter observed that it would be vastly easier to "stand by the President" if the President himself would stand still.

Colonel Harvey turns to Justice Hughes because he is just as good an American as Colonel Roosevelt, "twice as sound and many times as trustworthy"; because he is not "living on borrowed time," as is the case with Mr. Root. Some, he says, distrust the supporters of Root, many are angry at Roosevelt, not a few—including some Democrats—are sick of Wilson; but there is none among the people "whose countenance fails to brighten at the mention of Hughes."

(*From the Rochester Post-Express*)

Colonel Harvey of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, whose opinions on men and things political are of unfailing interest, has come to the conclusion that the campaign of frightfulness which Colonel Roosevelt waged against the Republican party, renders his nomination by that party impossible, unthinkable, wholly and everlastingly out of the question.

In this as in much else, the mind of Colonel Harvey must be considered eminently clear. Colonel Roosevelt's last act of a quasi public nature has sickened, alienated, antagonized thousands of Republicans who had not up to that time declared themselves against him. But when he sent Judge Nortoni forth, or allowed him to go forth, and declare that if Senator Root were nominated for the Presidency, Colonel Roosevelt would not support him but would run on a third ticket in order, if possible, to compass his defeat,—when Roosevelt gave out this statement through his henchman, hosts of Republicans saw him, as they never had before, in his true light, and resolved that he should never under any conceivable circumstances have their votes.

(*From the Troy Record*)

"Nobody wants Hughes—nobody but the people." This is Colonel Harvey's way of saying that the Justice will be nominated at Chicago. This Colonel is talking.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*From the Geneva Times*)

Colonel Harvey, who was the original Wilson man, now stands for Justice Hughes. Rather significant and typifies a somewhat general attitude.

"DON MARQUIS"

(*From the Evening Sun*)

Colonel George Harvey comes out for Justice Hughes for President.

With all due respect to Colonel Harvey, we don't want him to pick the next President for us. Look what he did the last time.

THE MIDDLE WEST

MICHIGAN

(*From the Detroit Free Press*)

Colonel Harvey sizes up one feature of the Presidential campaign accurately when he says, "Nobody is for Hughes but the people." The Hughes boom is a remarkable incident in our recent politics.

It has grown in a different manner than Presidential booms of late years. It is spontaneous, not artificial. There has never been any inspired and directed effort to give the Justice prominence. No press agents have been at work, no orators have beaten the big drum, no organization has deftly put the suggestion in the public mind that the people want him. Yet everywhere throughout the country the idea seemed to originate simultaneously that Hughes was the man this year, and the sentiment has spread until now almost every test made of Republican opinion shows him leading all others either as first choice or as second after a complimentary vote is delivered to a favorite son.

This unusual phenomenon has developed not only without the fostering guidance of party leaders but actually in spite of their open opposition. The men who are generally meant when the expression "bosses" is used, meaning the nationally prominent men of both parties, are candid in deprecating the suggestion of nominating the Justice, Republicans because they do not regard Hughes as tractable and sincerely distrust the effect of his leadership on their organization, Democrats because they recognize him as a man who would be very hard to beat. But the "little bosses," the Republican politicians who come into direct contact with the voters and who know at first hand what the voters are saying, almost without exception are for Hughes. They want to win this year, and they are convinced that with the name of Charles E. Hughes at the top of the ticket a sweeping victory is sure.

Yes, the Hughes boom is remarkable. It is quite a while in American politics since the Presidency has had to seek the man, but we are witnessing a manifestation of that much admired principle at present.

"A TRUE-BLUE AMERICAN"

(*From the Mt. Clemens Monitor*)

The Monitor is not one of those who believe that a man should not seek an office. The right to run for office is an inalienable right. As a general proposition there should be more men—not fewer—seeking office.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

However, as to the high office of the Presidency, it is rather a good thing to see the people spontaneously, enthusiastically demanding the nomination of a man who to-day more completely fills their eye than any other. We refer to Justice Hughes. In the current number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, in a striking and able article, Colonel George Harvey declares that Hughes will be the Republican nominee. "Nobody wants him," says the Colonel—"except the people" and they will have him. The deep significance of this statement is realized when it is remembered that somewhere on the person of Woodrow Wilson is a brand, "Made by George Harvey."

Justice Hughes is not a candidate for the nomination, and will not be. He will not lift his little finger to secure the nomination, and should not. To do that would indeed be "dragging the ermine of our highest court in the mire," as it is expressed. Justice Hughes has no managers anywhere. He has no press bureau, sending out proofs and plates to publishers. He has no traveling agents and tinhorn players. He has but the confidence of the people, which is plenty. He has no factional alliances. He has no foes to placate, no friends to apologize for. He has no fences to fix up. His nomination would find the whole Republican party in the harness and a lot of other fellows with it.

Justice Hughes is a man of the highest ability as an executive, demonstrated in his service as Governor of New York. He is a student of great questions. He is a fearless and true-blue American. He is just the right age, in possession of his full physical strength.

It is said that Justice Hughes is opposed by the "big bosses," who don't like him, but is favored by the "little bosses," who know the people.

Can the "big bosses" stop him? We don't think so. It looks now as though nothing could stop him except a flat declaration from himself, that he would not run if nominated.

(*From the Grand Rapids News*)

It begins to look as if we may as well make up our minds that Justice Hughes will be the nominee of the Republican Party for President of the United States. Colonel George Harvey, the picker of Presidents, writes an article in the current number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, the heading and gist of which is: "Nobody for Hughes—but the people."

OHIO

(*From the Columbus Journal*)

Colonel George Harvey, in an article in the May number of THE NORTH AMERICAN, says Charles Evans Hughes will be the next Republican candidate for President of the United States. The Colonel has been a mighty good prophet in the past and he may be now. He first predicted Wilson's election. He is not much for Roosevelt. Look at his very vehement and intemperate language:

"Whoever says Our Colonel is a candidate is a liar. He is no hill climber. He is Mahomet. If the mountain sees fit to come to him, it may bask in the glories of Heaven; if not, it can go to hell."

Thus Colonel Harvey jumps into the political arena with both feet; but there is no use bringing "hell" into the fray. The indications are that the next President of the United States will be the right man in the right place.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*From the Burlington Hawkeye*)

Editor George Harvey of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW picks Justice Hughes as the next President. Four years ago he picked Wilson and was right. Now we well see whether Colonel Harvey just happened to make a lucky shot four years ago or whether he can hit the bull's-eye every crack.

(*From the Milwaukee Sentinel*)

The Old Guard incurables may not like Hughes; the interests comprehensively labeled "Wall Street" would prefer Root or Roosevelt. But Justice Hughes' real peril of nomination and election lies in the multiplying evidences that the people who will do the real choosing in November want Hughes.

We doubt if he can escape.

PENNSYLVANIA

(*From the Harrisburg Telegraph*)

In his characteristic and always interesting way, Colonel George Harvey, the original Wilson man, is out in the May issue of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for Justice Charles Evans Hughes as the man of the people for President. He discusses the political situation from Dan to Beersheba and, after pointing out Colonel Roosevelt's alleged shortcomings and the attitude of the influential leaders of the country toward Root and others, Colonel Harvey declares that nobody wants Hughes—"nobody but the people!" He suggests that the Colonel has overplayed the "frightfulness" policy in dealing with Wilson and has not profited from the knowledge "that it was not the prodigal son who possessed the fatted calf." This in allusion to the proposed getting together of the progressive and stalwart wings of the Republican Party. He further declares that while Hughes is opposed by political leaders and others, he is essentially the choice of the people, notwithstanding the effort to create an impression antagonistic to his selection on account of his judicial position. Again referring to Roosevelt, he says:

> Whoever says Our Colonel is a candidate is a liar. He is no hill-climber. He is a Mahomet. If the Mountain sees fit to come to him, it may bask in the glories of Heaven; if not, it can go to hell.

Thus Colonel Harvey discusses at length the Roosevelt element of the situation, basing his conclusions upon the rather doubtful attitude of many voters in different parts of the country. Contrary to the view of Joseph H. Choate, he thinks the nomination of Justice Hughes "would be far more likely to clarify the muddy turmoil of politics than to bespatter the judicial ermine—a consummation devoutly to be wished."

Manifestly Colonel Harvey, pursuing the rôle of prophet as in the period preceding the nomination of President Wilson, proposes to throw about his prophecies as many safeguards as possible, so that there may not be another flareback such as followed the election of President Wilson and his repudiation of Colonel Harvey.

Throughout the Hughes boom, as staged by the distinguished editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, there is repeatedly thrown upon the screen his epigrammatic and rapid-fire comment regarding the especial availability of the "candidate of the people." There is, in fact, throughout the whole editorial his argument summed up in the suggestion that Justice Hughes is "holding to the old-fashioned idea that the responsibilities of the Presidency are so great that it is not to be sought and must not be declined."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And there you have Colonel Harvey's latest inspiration and his conviction that "the overpowering issue will be one of men—of ability, of judgment, of fidelity, but above all of character." He believes that it will be Hughes or Wilson and that patriotism must dictate a choice between the two.

But notwithstanding Colonel Harvey's analysis of the situation the Republican sentiment of the country seems more and more to be crystallizing around the one proposition that the party will unitedly support the nominee of the Chicago convention whether his name be Hughes, Root, Knox, Brumbaugh or any other of the "favorite sons."

THE SOUTH

Henry Watterson

(From the Louisville Courier-Journal)

One may judge from this that Colonel Harvey is against Colonel Roosevelt. Yea, more than this, that he believes his defeat in the National Republican Convention possible. He has in point of fact an alternative. He has quit "scattering" among "favorite sons" and comes squarely out for Hughes. "Nobody wants him," he says sententiously, "but the people." Then, constituting himself "the people," the Editor of The North American Review makes an elaborate argument in favor of his man. He meets all objections; that he is a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; that he is not a candidate; that his position on contemporary questions is unknown; that, if nominated, he might not accept. But we can better serve our readers by letting Colonel Harvey speak for himself. He is always interesting. Here he is earnest, and, if not convincing, yet suggestive. * * *

We shall offer no apology for these voluminous extracts. They are full of pith if not of moment. They are not without wisdom from the highbrow point of view. They appeal to intelligent people—though mainly to the intelligence of Eastern people—and carry conviction only to those who are already convinced.

Colonel Harvey cannot out of his fancy manufacture another President. He cannot make a Lincoln out of Mr. Justice Hughes. Nor yet a Destiny. If Fate had intended Hughes for President Fate would have landed him in the White House in 1909.

When the Braves get to Chicago they will prefer to take a chance with the Colonel than rush headlong upon the Roosevelt spear "that knows no brother." They can see no speculation in those cold, steel-gray eyes that Hughes doth glare with. They can make whatever deals they please with Roosevelt. The Room Marked "Private" transferred from New York and the oblong mahogany table, "with good Bacon lines," with "Root, hog, or die," the issue—Gary on one side with Big Money and Perkins on the other side with the Big Stick—where then, oh, George, where will you and the "People" be?

Casper S. Yost

(From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat)

Close upon the heels of the *Literary Digest* poll of Republican State legislators, showing a large majority favorable to the nomination of Justice Hughes for President, a poll confirmatory of those taken of Republican

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

editors and readers of high-class journals, America's foremost prophet, Colonel George Harvey, editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVEIW, predicts the nomination of Justice Hughes and his acceptance of the call of his country. He says: "Never since this Republic demanded that George Washington become its first President has there appeared so striking an instance of the office seeking the man."

Colonel Harvey, it should be remembered, as early as 1909 predicted Wilson's election, and later predicted the nomination of Taft, the independent race of Roosevelt and the comparative standing of the three Presidential candidates in the results of 1912. Had he lived a few centuries ago he would have been prosecuted for witchcraft. Colonel Harvey gives many concrete illustrations of the popular demand for Hughes, insistent in the face of every variety of organized opposition. He seems personally reconciled to the result and zestfully brushes aside the puerile objections to the Justice accepting the nomination.

He shows the views of Hughes on the tariff, foreign relations, peace, preparedness and bosses, quoting his utterances and pointing to his example. He points to his courage and his stability. He argues that a man of his moral and intellectual strength may be depended upon to apply the general principles he is known to hold to the specific problems of the future, some still unknown, without being blown about by every wind of doctrine. It is Hughes the courageous, unwavering statesman the people want and not some shifty disciple of expediency.

Colonel Harvey also shows that Hughes was not a candidate for Governor of New York and did not turn his hand to get a renomination. He did not seek that high office, any more than he seeks the Presidency. His declarations about the Governorship have the same ring as his statements about the Presidency. He is not a candidate, but Colonel Harvey believes that "this old-fashioned man holds firmly to the old-fashioned idea that the responsibilities of the Presidency are so great that it ought not to be sought and must not be declined."

THOMAS W. LOYLESS

(*From the Augusta Chronicle*)

With his kind permission, *The Chronicle* devotes the major portion of its editorial columns to-day to a rather extensive review of a characteristically trenchant and forcible survey of the present tense situation in the Republican Party by Colonel George Harvey, in the May number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, of which he is the brilliant and far-seeing editor.

As the man who "discovered" Woodrow Wilson and thereby rendered it possible for Bryan, at Baltimore, and Roosevelt, by his revolt, to make Mr. Wilson President, Colonel Harvey is recognized as easily the best writer in America on national and international politics—or on any other subject, as for that matter—and in his survey of the present Republican situation he is George Harvey at his best.

E. W. BARRETT

(*From the Birmingham Age-Herald*)

These are strong words, but Colonel Harvey is a master of strong words and creates the impression of saying what he thinks, whether one agree with him or not. He was at no pains to spare the feelings of the American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people regarding their unpopularity abroad and on numerous other occasions he has stated frankly just where he stands.

According to a popular conception of the cartoonists, Mr. Hughes is a sphinx, and regardless of what he hears, maintains unbroken silence. This is explained by the fact that his judicial position prevents him from expressing his political views and permitting it to be known whether or not he would accept the Republican nomination. No such restriction curbs Colonel Roosevelt, who continues to make more noise than all the favorite sons put together and despite the finality of Colonel Harvey's prediction, may be willing to oblige the "mountain" by going to meet it half way, and seems just now the inevitable standard-bearer for the Republicans in the next Presidential campaign.

It will be interesting to recall Colonel Harvey's prediction after the Republican convention meets in Chicago. A wise prophet leaves himself a loophole to crawl through when his predictions are not verified.

TENNESSEE

(*From the Knoxville Sentinel*)

The Hughes boom now leads the Republican Derby and seems to be steadily forging away from the field.

Colonel George Harvey, who "discovered" Woodrow Wilson in New Jersey and lost him in the Manhattan Club, while no doubt in the humor of "anybody to beat Wilson" is sure it will be "Hughes or Wilson."

"Nobody wants Hughes—nobody but the people," is the conclusion Colonel Harvey reaches as the result of an exhaustive analysis of the Republican situation in the May number of THE NORTH AMERICAN.

The *Literary Digest* just to hand reports a poll conducted by it corroborative of Colonel Harvey's opinion.

Certainly, if "straw" ballots can ever be relied upon to show the drift of the wind, the Colonel appears to be surely fading out of the picture at Chicago, unless he still hopes to use his Progressive nomination "big stick" to coerce the convention.

POLITICAL FORECASTS

(*From the Bookseller*)

The news-stand sales of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, it is authoritatively stated, have shown a marked increase during every Presidential election year, a fact not to be wondered at in view of the remarkably able and prophetic editorship. As the coming election is the most important since that of Abraham Lincoln, the following statements have peculiar significance and interest: "In 1904 Mr. George Harvey predicted that Mr. Roosevelt would receive 314 electoral votes—he received 336. In 1908 he predicted that Mr. Taft would receive 338 votes in the Electoral College—he received 321. In his editorial, 'The Political Predestination of Woodrow Wilson,' which appeared in the March, 1911, number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW (over eighteen months prior to election), Mr. Harvey said: 'The finger of Predestination, guided by Logic, Circumstance, Conditions and History, points unerringly to Woodrow Wilson, Democrat, as the opponent of William H. Taft, Republican, in 1912.' In October, 1912, Mr. Harvey predicted that Mr. Taft would carry only Utah and Vermont, as the event proved."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTEMPORARY ECHOES

A "DANIELS" COME TO JUDGMENT

(From the Boston Advertiser.)

One of the best remembered stories of the Arabian Nights is that which tells of the wicked old man who fastened himself on the shoulders of his victim, who had to be carried wherever the latter went. It looks very much as if Josephus Daniels had become the "Old Man of the Sea" of the present Administration.

Colonel Harvey, in his recently printed word of warning to his good friend, the President, declared that it looks as if the latter must soon get rid of his Secretary of the Navy, unless he wants Mr. Daniels to become a rather unpleasant and very damaging campaign issue. The advice is good; but Mr. Wilson's closest associates declare that he does not care for advice; that he solves his own problems in solitary meditation, regardless of what his friends may say. And it looks very much as if the President had determined not to ask the Secretary of the Navy to quit the Cabinet, although naturally he would be greatly relieved in mind if the Secretary were to go, of his own volition.

But Mr. Daniels shows no inclination to go. He is the one man in this country who cannot see whither his incompetence, his unwisdom and his utter inability to get on with his Admirals, have finally brought the navy. Worse than this, the Secretary has grossly offended the public's idea of fair play. He has had free say about his subordinates—they declare much of what he has said to be untrue—and yet he refuses to allow these men to reply publicly to his unfair comments on their acts and policies.

With all deference to the sincerity and the earnestness of President Wilson, may it not be said that he is at fault in talking preparedness so long as he persists in keeping Mr. Daniels in the Cabinet? No amount of talk can reconcile the two attitudes.

(From the Wheeling Intelligencer)

It is doubtful if any heed will be paid by the President to the outspoken warning given by the editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, in the current issue of that publication. The significance of this warning lies in the close relations that existed between the editor of THE REVIEW, Colonel George Harvey, and Mr. Wilson. The President is warned to get rid of his incompetent Secretary of the Navy at once, unless he wants deliberately to court defeat in the election in November. The most becoming thing Bryan ever did was to retire from an office he felt himself unfitted for and uncomfortable in, which makes the sticking of Daniels all the more reprehensible. Colonel Harvey, in his frank advice, intimates that the Administration can never

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

withstand the disclosure, certain to come sooner or later, of our naval administration. The full story of Secretary Daniels' arbitrary and shamefully unjust acts designed to discredit faithful officers, which have resulted in the partial demoralization and the utter disheartenment of the service, remains to be told.

In addition to Colonel Harvey's indictment, we have Secretary Daniels' extraordinary performance before the House Committee on Naval Affairs recently, and his malicious reflections on Admiral Fiske. It is pretty well known that the Secretary of the Navy, instead of listening to the men who have spent their lives in studying our national defense, has insisted on substituting his own pet vagaries and fads. In answer to the remonstrances of patriotic officers, he has said that if he were going to let our American Admirals have their own way he "might as well go home." Although he did not know it, that is the one sensible idea that Josephus ever had. But the trouble has been that he never went.

(*From the Albany Knickerbocker Press*)

Colonel George Harvey, discoverer of Dr. Woodrow Wilson, and chief promulgator of the doctor's virtues until he was admonished by the discovered person that withdrawal of support would be worth more than assistance, has cast a few shells from the sixteen-inch rifles of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW in the direction of Fort Daniels—just to find the range. Colonel Harvey uses such unparliamentary nouns, adverbs and adjectives, in a brief discussion of our first lord of the admiralty, as these:

shifty	suppression
deceit	disingenuous
disagreeable	delude
arbitrary	shamefully
unjust	demoralization
disheartenment	ignorance
distortion	brazenly
emasculated	subterfuge
deception	inadequate
inaccurately	

To these unhandsome parts of speech, Colonel Harvey adds the assurance that the term "a daniels" is now familiar throughout the navy as synonymous with a shorter and, if conceivable, uglier word.

(*From the Rochester Post-Express*)

"A Pottering Politician." This is the description given to Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy, by Colonel George Harvey, "the original Wilson man," in his latest issue of his magazine, THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. Colonel Harvey's article is a scathing analysis of the Tar Heel statesman, in which he convicts him, out of his own mouth and by the cumulative testimony which naval officers have given recently before the Naval Committee of the House, of making misleading statements about the navy. Referring to the Wilson-Daniels naval program, Colonel Harvey says: "His program is not a program. It is a sham, designed expressly to serve present political purposes while carrying the burden of expenditures forward to future years."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After convicting Daniels, not only of making misleading statements on almost every subject with which he has to deal, but of making such statements deliberately, Colonel Harvey explains that "a daniels" has come into common use in the navy as synonymous with "a shorter and, if conceivable, uglier word."

(*From the Parkersburg, W. Va., News*)

Nowadays, when one wishes to apply to some untruthful person a designation expressing the unreliability of the person in question, he need not select "prevaricator," "falsifier," "disciple of Ananias," or any of those polite and tongue-twisting phrases. With the greatest propriety he may choose a shorter and uglier word, the same being "daniels."

For that word, in the vernacular of the United States Navy, has become a title of opprobrium, and the jolly jack tar to whom it is applied has cause for inciting personal violence. The why and how of the evolution of this word is explained by Colonel George Harvey, "the original Wilson man," in the most recent issue of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

After completing probably the most complete scorching ever given to a favorite subject, Colonel Harvey concludes: "There for the present we shall leave the Secretary of the Navy, drearily hoping and faithfully promising to ignore other phases, no less savory, of his maladministration, unless finally confronted by the dread certainty that

"A vote for Wilson is a vote for Daniels."

(*From the Rutland Herald*)

Among the journalistic Jeremiahs of the day, none wields a more trenchant and searing pen than Colonel George Harvey, former Vermonter and now publisher of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, one of the few remaining critical magazines which retain the snap and vigor of newspaper timeliness and phraseology.

Colonel Harvey calls Secretary Josephus Daniels of the Navy Department a "pottering politician." He declares the Secretary's statements before important Congressional committees have been proven untruthful in almost every material respect.

Despite the somewhat frantic efforts of the Administration's champions to divert the storm of popular condemnation from Daniels, it is plain enough to most people that his appointment was not only a mistake, but his retention is one of the millstones which will assuredly drag the Wilson Administration down.

"A vote for Wilson is a vote for Daniels," says Colonel Harvey. Can any purely personal popularity survive such a terrific handicap?

(*From the Boston Herald*)

The hardest thing for George Harvey to swallow at present is: "a vote for Wilson will be a vote for Daniels."

A DISPASSIONATE VIEW

(*From the Grand Rapids News*)

"See straight. Think straight. Then, in consequence, as a matter of course, act straight. These are urgent needs of the time, for the Govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment; and in this country as we so often boast and too often fail to realize and to practice, the Government means the whole people. Never, probably, in all our history, have these needs been greater than they now are. That is partly because of the transcendent importance of the issues confronting us. It is also partly because of the exceptional and unprecedented efforts which are being persistently made to befog those issues and to mislead the popular and official mind."

Colonel George Harvey, editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, has furnished many gems of thought to the American people. He also enjoys the distinction of having picked more Presidential winners than any man of this time, but we doubt that he ever in one paragraph has stated a situation more plainly or brought home a greater truth.

Pour it all in the melting pot, and after it's refined, analyze the result. Try to take the view our children and grandchildren will take 50 years from now. Look straight. What will they care about our Mexican policy or the sugar tax or the treasury during a time when half the world tried to drag us into a war?

As stated in this column a few days ago, no one man is responsible for the will of the American people. But one man may be responsible for carrying out that will.

If the Democratic party is wise, it will change its platform to rectify some of its traditional mistakes and cash in on the strength of its leader. We cannot hope for this, however, if we are to judge by the political history of the past. It's too simple to be true.

But it would be a relief to welcome a President and Administration born of straight sight, straight thought and consequent straight action.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

MEXICAN NEEDS

SIR,—I believe the point has been reached in the affairs of Mexico where a strong article from you in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, setting forth a constructive policy for the re-establishment of the finances and commerce of the country, would result in putting an end to military rule and rehabilitating civil government and law and order. An article of the force and clear perception of the letter to the London *Times* would most certainly open the way for a practical solution of the almost insurmountable difficulties now confronting the present *de facto* Government.

There is a much less formidable opposition to the present acting Government than there has been to any other since the beginning of the Madero revolution, but there is a great deal of unrest in Mexico because of the frightful economic conditions. The wheels of commerce have been inactive for about five years; vast numbers of acres of tillable land are idle, and the livestock from most ranches (except those of foreigners) has been disposed of; the railroads are in the hands of the military authorities, are being poorly operated and no provision made for up-keep; thousands of cars and nearly all bridges have been burnt, the latter being replaced with make-shifts; law and justice are being administered by military and quasi-military officers with arbitrary powers; most railroad stations and water-tanks and many valuable mining and other industrial plants have been destroyed by fire; the Carranza money, the only circulating medium of exchange, is worth only about two cents upon the dollar; food-stuffs are scarce and prices high, and but little employment in the normal pursuits of peace is available; the cost of maintaining the military forces in the field has been, and is, enormous, and has been met by forced loans, confiscations, and contributions, there being no steady revenue coming in from any source; want and poverty are in evidence everywhere.

The property-owning classes of Mexico would now be satisfied with any Government in the hands of their own people, whether of their particular faction or not, that could give some assurance of stability and some guarantee of protection to the rights of life, liberty, and property.

Undoubtedly what is needed, and what must come quickly if anarchy is not to hold sway, is a dollar worth at least ten cents in gold. There has been so much fiat money in circulation in Mexico within the last few years that any new issue must be backed by a pledge of redemption which will inspire confidence.

It is not my purpose to urge any theories of my own upon you, and certainly I would not undertake to suggest any detailed plan, but I do wish

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to say that the most promising means that occurs to me for bringing about the desired result is through a commission of Mexicans working in conjunction with a commission of Americans who are in touch with American financial interests. They could jointly devise a financial scheme under which American capital could be had to back up the necessary issue of currency, based upon Mexican securities. The American capital would not be forthcoming unless there were some guarantee of a stable Government. The only feasible way to furnish such a guaranty would be through a signed alliance between the United States and the *de facto* Government of Mexico, under which the United States would pledge the aid of its military forces to maintain peace, and under which the United States, with the acquiescence of Mexico, would agree to become responsible for the peace of Mexico in all events until the payment of the contemplated loan.

My knowledge of the weaknesses and prejudices of the Mexican people (and I do not wish to be understood as detracting in any way from their many good qualities) causes me to feel that this latter condition would be the stumbling-block. Every assurance could be given that their sovereignty would be respected, come what may. They have suffered so heavily and so long that they should be willing to make any reasonable concession that would bring them the help which they so sorely need at this time.

If something along this line could be worked out through which the American Government and American capital will go to the assistance of the Mexican people in this hour of their trouble, it would be an evidence of our good-faith and friendliness, and, in the end, would have the effect of allaying to some extent the strong anti-American feeling so prevalent throughout Mexico.

Undoubtedly any suggestion made should have to do with the finances and commerce of the country only, and all matters of government should be left entirely in the hands of the present *de facto* Government. Of course, it would be most advisable to give representation to all factions upon this commission, including the great body of property-owning refugees now in this country (as to these latter, an amnesty act that would invite them home and insure them against persecutions would be greatly helpful).

Much has been said in criticism of the Mexico policy of the Wilson Administration, but Mr. Roosevelt and the other complainants do not come forward with any specific suggestions calculated to clear up the situation. What is needed now is something helpful in the line of what must be done to bring Mexico conditions back to normal. The force and cogency of your writings and the prestige of your magazine, combined, seem to point to you as the logical exponent of a plan by which Carranza may be lead out of the wilderness.

W. C. Douglas.

San Antonio, Texas.

IS INDIA LOYAL TO HER MASTERS?

Sir,—There is published an article by the pen of Mr. Sydney Brooks in the valuable columns of The North American Review for the month of April. In answer to that article, I request you to publish this letter in your esteemed magazine, which has stood for justice and fair play between contending interests and causes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Brooks writes that "since the war, India has given us not one hour of real anxiety. She has been admirably tranquil, resolute and faithful. Some disquieting incidents, mainly fomented by professional revolutionaries who make their headquarters in California, have occurred, but there has been absolutely nothing to justify the alarmist rumors which occasionally find their way into the American press."

This is absolutely false. The New Defense of India Act, which was passed into law by the Viceroy's Legislative Council on March 18, 1915, was put into operation before the Lahore conspiracy case began. A notification of the *Gazette Extraordinary* of March 24th directed that section 3 of the act shall come into force in the states of the Punjab, Northwestern Frontier Province, and Bengal, including more than one hundred million of the inhabitants of India, and gradually the operation of the act was extended until now it includes the whole of India. Prior to the arrest of a few immigrants returned from Canada and America, 4,185 men had been arrested in the district of Jhung, and since the Lahore conspiracy the arrest, imprisonment and execution of revolutionists have been numerous throughout the whole of India.

Mr. Brooks writes that the trouble is fomented by "professional revolutionists who make their headquarters in California." The object of Mr. Brooks in spreading such misinformation seems to be twofold: First: To bring us, if possible, into conflict with the authorities of this country. Second: To persuade the civilized world to believe that the political unrest in India has been manufactured artificially by the enemies of England or by a few Hindus who have lived abroad, and that it is not a natural reaction on the part of the people of India as a whole against the unbearable tyranny of the British Government.

The truth of the matter is quite the reverse. The British in India are in peril. A correspondent of *India*, a paper published in London, writes from Bombay that "no Englishman is safe in India, and on this account the Englishwomen are preparing to leave India." In the Lahore revolutionary case, which is being tried within the confines of the central jail, Lahore, before the special Military Commission appointed by the New Defense of India Act (which in effect establishes martial law) the Government prosecutor, Mr. B. Petman, says: "In spite of the arrest of the majority of the leaders, the conspiracy continued, and further acts in pursuance of the conspiracy were committed. The police arrested 300, but nobody was willing to testify against them on account of the fear of the revolutionists."

Mr. Brooks states that the princes and the masses are fighting for their King. True it is that some Indians are fighting in the British Army, and a few have volunteered their services. But who are they? They are the Indian soldiers who are part of the British-Indian army in India, whom poverty has driven to enlist under the British Flag. As professional soldiers, whose interest lies in pay only, they are required to fight whenever wanted. Hence, when this great European war broke out, a large number of the Indian soldiers were shipped to Europe who were completely unaware of their proper destination! Some of them thought they were to be shipped from one Indian port to another, while others surmised that they were sailing for Africa!

As regards the rest—who are, by the way, few in number—they are the adventurers and place-seekers. Those few Indian princes who are hanging

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

around the British camp in France, those "bejewelled" rajahs who are subscribing to the British war-relief fund and aiding in other ways: who are they and what are they? Always lying in the clutches of the tyrannical British, always compelled by brute force to follow at the beck and call of the British, and as such always subservient to the British caprice without any will of their own, and practically prisoners in their own palaces, these Indian princes have been compelled to unloosen the strings of their purses to help—as the Imperial mandate has said—a "holy cause for humanity"! Being always watched and suspected and never trusted by the British Government, and politically being absolutely impotent to exert any independent will of their own, these maharajas are doing what they are ordered to do directly or indirectly.

The sentiments and feelings of the masses on whom the crushing weight of British rule falls heavily are not reflected in the actions of these hypocritical opportunists. The masses of the Indian people, hitherto inarticulate, are giving vent to their expression by other means, and gradually are making their voices heard, though hardly an echo of that voice reaches the outside on account of the British "love of justice and fair-play"! At present their voice is entombed by the British censorship established to prosecute a war for "humanity."

Everyone should bear in mind that out of a total of 700 Hindu princes, only five went to Europe. Only three of these went to the front; two fell sick in London, and after six months they all returned to India. On the other hand, two Hindu princes, the brother of the reigning prince of Daspala and the Raja of Kharwa, one of the Rajput States, have been arrested for sedition. The first was sentenced to transportation for life, and the other to two years' imprisonment. Two hundred interned Hindus have been hanged and shot at Lahore, Ambala, Delhi, Meeruth, Calcutta, Orissa, Jhansi, etc. Five hundred have been transported for life, and 5,000 interned without trial, including professors, students, physicians, priests, editors, peasants, social reformers, and soldiers, during the year 1915.

RAM CHANDRA,
Editor *Hindustan Gadar*.

BOSTON ENGLISH

SIR,—In the November number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW you gave a very clever dialogue on the subject of "Patriotism and Profits, A Conversation About Bonds." The scene is laid in Boston and the *dramatis personae* are introduced in a way to make one eager for the substance of the talk.

To my mind, your reasoning is good and your conclusions satisfactory. Had you laid the scene in New York this letter would not have been written; but as you are now Editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, an old Boston enterprise, I venture to call attention to the fact that you attribute to Mr. Worthington language a Bostonian of his type would not have used. At about the middle of page 656, he is made to say: "Our feet are in the water; presumably we will be swimming because we must." And the nephew replies: "But the more we do the more we will help the Allies."

I can't answer for a Harvard graduate of the present day. The use of correct English is not a prominent qualification of college graduates in these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

times. Mr. Worthington, however, would have been rather more particular. But say! Why not bring THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW back to Boston—and its editor with it? I am sure he would be welcomed and he could feel confident that here the good old word "shall" is still in use. You have become influenced by your environment over there in New York.

Now I can hear you tear this up and say, "Isn't that just like Boston!" But hold! I am not a vicious critic, I express only the solicitude of an esoteric friend who looks forward monthly to the virile utterances of a congenial mind.

HERBERT COOLIDGE.

WATERTOWN, MASS.

[In presenting our portrait of Mr. Worthington, we were not striving for abstract and meticulous literary quality, but for realistic fidelity of denotement; and Mr. Worthington, as we conceived him, would, in the stress of momentous argument, have been likely to say "will" rather than "shall." We never asserted that Mr. Worthington was a Harvard graduate: we merely said he was a Bostonian; and the speech of Boston, in these days, is far from academically precise. For example, they call a dairy-lunch a "café."—EDITOR.]

THE MAHLER SYMPHONY

SIR,—I wonder why your able critic, Mr. Lawrence Gilman, in his remarks about the Mahler symphony, says nothing about its production beyond the mere fact that it was produced? Is it because he considered its rendition in the "also ran" class? or perhaps that the perfecting of the technical portion, if I may use that term, of so vast and complicated a work, is an achievement of no especial merit? Let us hope that it is not the result of the provincialism so common in New York, which accords no praise to efforts of any kind which have not their inception in that metropolis. It was my privilege to hear the verdict of some of the great musicians of the world upon the performance of this composition, a few of whom heard the first production in Munich conducted by the composer, and, in addition to the unqualified praise which they bestowed upon the Philadelphia performance, they also said it was the better of the two. Of course, this is not news to Mr. Gilman. His analysis of the composition as such would seem to indicate that he is an erudite and experienced man, and that is the reason for my saying, Why?

C. M. LAMMOT.

GERMANTOWN, PA.

[Our music critic, being sworn, deposes that the pages which he could give to a consideration of the Mahler symphony were unavoidably limited, and that, in view of the extraordinary character of Mahler's music, he conceived it his duty to devote his restricted space to a discussion of the symphony itself, inasmuch as the brilliantly effective presentation of the difficult score by Mr. Stokowski and his forces in Philadelphia had already received abundant and competent praise in the newspapers. Music, after all, is more important than musicians.

We trust that this explanation, prosaic though it is, will acquit us of the exciting but, we believe, libellous charge of critical "provincialism."—EDITOR.]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED